L128

THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE OF PROGRESS IN RELIGION

SEPTEMBER 1916

"Speak unto this people that they go forward"

New York Chicago
San Antonio

An Appeal! Also an Investment!

The Unitarian Church at Lawrence, Mass., is planning to celebrate its Seventieth Birthday in October, 1917, by opening a new church building. We can get a clear title to our property and commence building operations in May, 1916, if we can immediately raise

$10,000.00

We did not think we could do it, but we are assured of $5,000 already; who will help us obtain the rest? We have contributed to send Unitarianism to many Middle and Western states in our prosperous days. Today we present a Missionary opportunity ourselves.

Our New Building Will Have Social Service and Liberal Educational Facilities And Is A Good Investment Where Returns Sought Are Ethical And Spiritual.

See article in March Unitarian Advance. Send checks to **Arthur C. Dyer, Treas., Lawrence, Mass.**, or **Rev. William S. Nichols, North Andover, Mass.**

Pacific Unitarian School

for the Ministry.

BERKELEY, CAL. **Founded 1904**

Aims at thorough and scientific scholarship; emphasizes the application of religious ideals to municipal and social as well as individual life; gives complete preparation for the modern ministry and social service. It works in co-operation with the University of California and other Divinity Schools and affords an unusually wide choice of courses. Open to both sexes.

The year begins August 16, 1915. Write for the Register and complete information to the President,

EARL MORSE WILBUR, D. D.,
Pacific Unitarian School, Berkeley, California.

Mr. Pulsford's Sermons

Recent Issues Are:

"Mountains and Men"
"The Wide Prospect"
"By What Authority"
"Wash in the Nearest River"
"Mere Getting Together"

Copies (5c each) may be had by mail from Unitarian Headquarters, 105 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

The Meadville Theological School

(Established 1844)

MEADVILLE, PA.

Trains men and women for a liberal and progressive ministry.

For catalogue address the president,

F. C. SOUTHWORTH

Advertising Rates

List prices per month: special discounts for longer contracts.

1 Page	$10.00
Half Page	6.00
Quarter Page	4.00

Copy for advertisements must be furnished by the 20th of each month.

THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE

GEORGE H. BADGER, Editor

ERNEST C. SMITH, Assistant Editor.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:—John Haynes Holmes, Edgar S. Wiers, George R. Gebauer, Alson H. Robinson, Albert R. Vail, Frederick R. Griffin, J. E. Williams, Charles P. Wellman, R. D. Van Tassel, C. W. Reese.

CONTENTS FOR SEPTEMBER, 1916

PAGE

Editorials 3

Religion and Truth ..... *Rev. James G. Townsend* 7

The Constructive Element in Religious Education .... *Rev. H. H. Burch* 8

Hard Lines (a poem) 10

A Man's Size Religion ..... *The Editor* 11

Modern Religious Movements in India ..... *J. T. Sunderland, D. D.* 14

A Baptist Sidelight 17

The Work in the College Towns ..... *Frederick M. Eliot* 18

A Tentative Plan for Church Progress ..... *Ralph J. Patterson* 19

Our Readers' Exchange 23

American Social Ideals ..... *Arthur Warner Littlefield* 24

Profaning the Old Hymns 27

A Creed (a poem) 28

Forward to First Principles 29

Muddleheadedness 30

Western Conference News 31

America for Me (a poem) 32

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS:—Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, of New York; Rev. Jabez T. Sunderland, of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; Pres. Franklin C. Southworth, of Meadville, Pa.; Rev. Thomas Van Ness, of Boston; Rev. Wilson M. Backus, of Minneapolis, Minn.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—One Dollar. Send remittance by check or money order, made payable to THE UNITARIAN ADVANCE, and addressed to the office of our Treasurer, 105 South Dearborn St., Chicago.

Office of Publication: MOUNT MORRIS, ILL.

NEW YORK, 61 East 34th Street. CHICAGO, 105 S. Dearborn Street.

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.

Entered as second class matter at the post office at Mount Morris, Ill.

What a Unitarian Church Means to a City

It means a place where men and women may gather and worship God without first committing themselves to belief in any creed or prescribed formula.

It means a place where man is not regarded as a fallen creature, to be redeemed only by belief in another; but is rather regarded as a creature possessing God-given and God-like attributes, and whose salvation is most likely to come through an intense belief in HIMSELF.

It means a place where divine truths are accepted and errors or contradictions rejected, regardless of their source; but where each individual is entitled to his own opinion as to which is truth and which error.

It means a place where Jesus is regarded, not as THE Son of God, but as A Son of God, the exemplary man; the greatest example of spiritual goodness in history; and because He was a man and represented human possibilities, His life and deeds and manly death are a constant source of inspiration to all men in all times.

It means a place where tolerance for all faiths is taught and encouraged; where love to God is linked inseparably with love to Man; where character and salvation are one; where men are judged, not by their opinions of Jesus, but by their likeness to Jesus.

Do you believe such a church should succeed? Then your place is in that church on Sunday mornings. You need the church; the church needs you. When you remain away you weaken its influence; when you come you give it strength.

If You are With Us, Be With Us at the Services

The Unitarian Advance

Formerly The Unitarian—Established 1906

Volume VII SEPTEMBER, 1916 Number 1

NEXT comes Billy Sunday's invasion of Boston—"the stronghold of infidel Unitarianism." The huge "tabernacle" on the Back Bay is already in course of construction, and the campaign of publicity very far advanced. We hope that great good will come to Boston as the result of the brusque shaking-up that is impending. We have already expressed our conviction that the Unitarians will be the largest beneficiaries. Billy Sunday will undoubtedly do the Unitarian cause much good at the seat of its highest prestige and influence.

* * *

LET us hasten to insist that this conviction is not merely cynical, nor the product of flippant denominational self-complacency. The chief good that Billy Sunday can do for Unitarians is to wake us up; put us rigorously to the test; force us—not, indeed, on the defensive on our own soil, but arouse us to a heightened sense of our own evangelical responsibilities. The first crude approximation of assertion as to what Billy Sunday ought to do for us comes easy to the lips: "Make us do what Billy Sunday is doing at his best, better than Billy Sunday is doing it!" That, indeed, would be a big contract, and enormously worth while, but it isn't the specific program on our hands, after all. For the big thing which Billy Sunday's grotesque agitation ought to do for us in Boston is to stir us on to do the thing we Unitarians have been doing when at our best, for a century or more, a thousand times better than we ever yet succeeded in doing it in any decade of that significant century.

* * *

SOMETIMES we are inclined to assert that New England is the ultimate test of the validity of the Unitarian faith. If we cannot make good with our gospel there, we cannot make good with it anywhere. If the story of a century of American Unitarianism is lacking in convincing warrants of success and encouragement in New England, in terms of satisfying statistics, growing influence and accumulating spiritual potency, it is useless to look for encouragement elsewhere. More careful thought impels us to insist that the ultimate test of American Unitarianism must rather lie in its capacity to make good outside of New England, and we must make ready to meet that test resolutely and eagerly. For New England Unitarianism is seriously handicapped by its own initial good fortunes. Its high social prestige, its unescapable intellectual tradition, its "noble heritage" in history, have undoubtedly been handicaps in many ways, to limit our scope of popular influence. For the severest hindrance to aggressive growth on our part has been that blight of genial self-complacency which has led us too often to greater concern about the proprieties of things than the stern realities of things, the maintenance of a tradition rather than the furthering of a cause.

* * *

A RELIGION that is predominantly sectional and local cannot assume for itself the dignity of a "national religion." We may argue as vociferously as we please about the "fitness" of our faith to meet the "fundamental American ideals" as no other gospel can meet them. We may prove by irrefutable logic that what Democracy means, and what Liberty means, and what Social Progress means, and what "the Advancing Civilization of the New World" means are exactly coincident with that beautiful gospel of religious liberalism which "our churches stand for." Argument and proof of logic go for nothing so long as the ruthless fact remains that the Unitarian church "stays put" in the region where it first emerged a century ago; that American Unitarianism is still chiefly a local survival of an early nineteenth century "split" in colonial Puritanism, with such sporadic additions outside of New England's sacred soil as New England missionary money can afford to pay for, and New England-bred clergymen be

persuaded to minister to, in an exalted spirit of "foreign-mission" self-sacrifice.

* * *

OF COURSE, we state the proposition with exasperating exaggeration. We speak with the accent of our enemies rather than our friends. In the Middle States, on the Pacific Coast and in some parts of the Central West a type of Unitarianism which is not merely transplanted New England culture has developed to rigorous triumphs of success. There never was a time in our history, moreover, when our honored Missionary Association was so earnestly engaged in well-directed endeavor to make non-New England Unitarianism less shadowy and incidental than it used to be. What we have to say goes directly to the text of the Association's recent program of enterprise. But its significance must be frankly recognized. It is not merely that we must have more churches of our faith on non-New England soil, and other centres of denominational expansion than the city of Boston, but we must have other types of Unitarianism than the classic New England type clearly manifest in our work; that the "America" that is in Texas and in Oklahoma, in Oregon and in Dakota, in Ohio and in Pennsylvania be as resolutely expressed by our "essentially national faith" as the "America" of Plymouth Rock and Faneuil Hall. And the "America—out yonder" is not preeminently a thing of culture or intellectual refinement. It is little worried about "social prestige." It is vehemently democratic, concerned more about the straight significances of manliness, fair-play, good brotherhood and neighborship, and the sort of success, material and intellectual, that counts for self-respect, than for the "dignity of tradition."

* * *

UNITARIANISM can only make good, the country over, by ceasing to be a "cult" and becoming a downright enthusiasm. In a crude and wrong-headed and too often meretricious way, Billy Sunday is trying to make of evangelical Christianity something farther reaching and more robust than the conventional thing which "just churches" stand for. The job on the hands of our Unitarian leaders today is something of the same sort, with infinitely deeper and truer significance. It is the displacement of a diminishing tradition by an exploit of eager *abandon* of prophetship. We believe that our modern liberal faith is preeminently fitted for just that thing.

* * *

OUR liberal gospel has two phases. We have paid a good deal of attention to one of these phases in our missionary propaganda; the other, we believe, has been most unfortunately slighted. The first phase involves our point of issue with dominant orthodoxy. We stand in aggressive protest against the antiquated errors of other churches. We have a controversy to urge against unreason and superstition. We must make bold championship for the cause of liberty, progress and open-mindedness in religious things. A large part of our denominational literature deals with this aspect of our gospel, and much of our preaching, at any rate on the missionary frontier, is of this order. This is important and should not be neglected.

* * *

BUT THE other phase of our missionary gospel is just as important and surely more fundamental: the constructive responsibility of giving to the world a positive message of essential faith, an accumulating interpretation of life's pressing realities, soul-reaching answers to soul-searching questions as to the meanings of life, the strong and reassuring voices of convictions that can convince. In other words, religion's great business at our hands is not to convince non-Unitarians why they ought to be Unitarians, or to delight Unitarians with assurances as to their rare good fortune in faith, but to bring to folks who are just folks, the resolute meanings of the best of things, in terms of conviction, incentive, enthusiasm, and gripping responsibility of manhood and womanhood. The trouble with our past has been that where our preaching has not been raspingly aggressive it has been tamely apologetic; and when it has been neither of these, it has been genially optimistic in a gripless philosophy of life remote from the actual problems of the common man and woman. Effectual Unitarianism is not a pleasant explanation of the ways of the Eternal, but a rousing challenge of responsibility to the hearts and consciences of

men. It must have quick, rational, vital, candidly convincing answers to the soul's questionings about God, soulship, character, destiny, immortality, and the like. But every such answer must come to focus in terms of ethical responsibility, of *drive* through moral incentive, or it fails. We believe that the second century of American Unitarianism will have more to be proud of than its first century, to the degree in which the dynamic appeal of righteousness is made dominant over the quiescent tones of optimistic complacency which has been our bane in the past. It may take a Unitarian Billy Sunday to shock and batter us into the achievement of the transformation. We would rather have it done some other way.

* * *

THE political campaign now waging has some features highly satisfactory, but some also that are not so pleasing to him who views civic affairs from religious and ethical viewpoints. Both candidates for the presidency, as offered by the two dominant parties, are men of exceptionally upright character and commanding intellectual worth, and neither party is presenting its candidate in association with principles or measures that are deemed unworthy or inimical to public welfare by any opponent. We are insured, therefore, against a campaign of demeaning vituperation or angry clash of warring ethical ideals. Indeed, it is here that some may find the chief cause of dissatisfaction. We are not waging a contest about commanding principles, and the leaders of the two opposing parties are wondrously alike in their more dominant personal characteristics. We are chiefly concerned with a campaign of criticism. The party of the opposition is in duty bound to bring its "indictment of error" against the administration in power, in the midst of one of the most trying and baffling periods of international complication that the nation has ever known. It is the good fortune of the opposition that it has for its leader not only a man of exceptional personal winsomeness, but a lawyer of surpassing skill as a prosecuting attorney. The business of criticism will be done exhaustively, unsparingly, brilliantly. The indictment of censure and the plea for condemnation will nowhere fail through inadequacy of him with whom the responsibility of the prosecution lies.

* * *

AND YET it is to be merely a "Campaign of Criticism" and its rebuttal, to which a great nation is to devote its inflamed attention for the next two months. As to principles, all parties are ostensibly agreed. All believe in "Americanism," whatever good thing that may mean; all believe in Preparedness, "to a reasonable degree;" all urge for "honorable peace," but for the stern maintenance of "national honor." Tariff and finance enter little into the controversy, and it is hard to tell just where the line of demarkation lies, as to policies in these fields. Both leading parties believe in rational attention to the safeguarding of laborers' rights, and the reasonable interests of honest business; both party platforms were written by the pens of "progressives," so that detached phrases from either could be easily palmed off as citations from the opposition platform without detection by the average voter. Even "Votes for Women" gets a hand from both parties, and practically the same hand, so far as platform promises go. No vital issue of statecraft or social progress seems anywhere involved in the stress of the campaign.

* * *

FOUR years ago the situation was different. Then we had with vivid frankness a campaign of *issues*. "Progressivism" as a definite and aggressive issue was pitted against "Rational Conservatism," whose bad name was "Standpatism." For Progressivism meant explicitly an enlargement of the methods of democracy, extension of the direct influence of popular will in public service, and as explicitly a curbing of the tendency of aggregated wealth to exert an undue dominance in social and industrial organization. To be sure, the forces of Progressivism were then divided into two camps, and the man that won the election received only a minority vote. But it is a stupid mistake to say that President Wilson gained his election only because the opposition was divided. For it was not the opposition that was divided; it was the successful party that was divided, while the opposition stood solid, unbroken, though miserably in minority. On the issue waged in 1912, one side stu-

pendously won, and the other side ignominiously lost, and the incoming administration was charged with the responsibility of making good on the issues for which that campaign was waged.

* * *

HAS THE administration made good on these issues? That might seem to be the inevitable question involved in the campaign in which that administration seeks re-election. The tragic fact of it all is that nobody now seems interested to ask that question. The Progressive party has forgotten its passion of progressivism; the Republican party has forgotten its ringing challenge of "the fallacies and perils of rash progressivism;" the administration in vain may seek to call attention to its accomplishments of constructive legislation, tariff reforms, federal banking laws, reforms touching commerce and industry, child labor legislation and the like. These things count for nothing, because the American people are no longer concerned about "issues" and "principles," they are interested only in a Criticism—a Criticism that involves no clash of ethical ideals, as it does not involve either any issue of personal turpitude or dishonor; but criticism as to judgments in action formed under sudden stress to meet certain unexpected and unprepared-for exigencies in the international relations of our nation with other nations in a time when all the other nations of the world seem to have gone mad in their wild debauch of war.

* * *

WE BELIEVE in criticism, as a tremendously important factor of progress, and he was a wise as well as witty statesman of England who declared his party "The Queen's Opposition." Every administration should welcome and challenge the most ruthless test of the criticism of the Opposition; and at the end of four years' leadership, the present administration at Washington receives no more than it deserves when it is taxed with the utmost relentlessness of detailed criticism of its every act and measure. One must remember, however, that in the competition between the man who has had to do things and the man whose function is to criticise what has been done, we have in final fact only the contrast between the man whose "ideal of perfection" is pitted against the man whose actual achievement has had the rough bafflement of stubborn situations which make all ideals of perfection creak and labor. The man who knows *afterwards* which road at the fork ought to be taken to avoid disaster, is not necessarily the man who will prove any wiser when the next fork in the road brings its baffling problem. The pity of the situation is that nowhere is any clear-cut ideal or principle involved. It may finally transpire that the contrast between one sort of "firmness" and another sort of "firmness" involves essential and ultimate ideal. It may even turn out that what is glibly sneered at as "vacillation and weakness" shall be revealed to be a steadfast purpose directed to a stern and noble goal. It is not our business to answer such questions, if even we may with propriety suggest them. But, after all, is it not timely for our American people to remind themselves that "foreign relations" are not the whole of American public service, that the battles of four years ago were not waged so vainly that it is nobody's interest how their issues have been dealt with by the party in power, and even in the stress and agony of world warfare the immediate issues of American democracy and social progress are not all to be forgotten? The fateful question for America, after all, is not how Mexico or Germany or Japan or England are to be dealt with, in the next four years, but how our fundamental American problems of industrial rectitude and commercial honor and social justice and civic progress are to be met, to undo some of the follies of the past and attain some of the dreams of the prophets for the future. Let's not leave these things out of the reckoning.

* * *

ONE of the most satisfactory triumphs of "presidential interference with legislation" is the recent passage of the national Child Labor Law. Congress did not want to pass it; the "Solid South" was very much against it; there was no particular political value in its passage. But the President believed that it ought to be passed; and after the Democratic caucus of Congress decided that it should not be passed, the President decided that it should—and he had his way. Those who worry about the over-preponderance

of Southerners in the chairmanships of congressional committees have doubtless not failed to notice that under the present administration it is not the chairmen of committees who always shape final legislation; and whatever may be said in criticism of President Wilson in other regards, it cannot be said that on any essential humanitarian or ethical issue he has failed to be positive, specific, persistent—and effectual.

* * *

FRIENDS of the "Equal Franchise" have surely much to rejoice over in the present situation. They have manifestly won their cause; the final consummation of their triumph is only a matter of time—and time not very long deferred. All political parties have "put themselves on record" on the right side. They have taken a step which none can retrace. Politically, there is "nobody left to oppose." It's just a question of how—by state enactment or national constitutional amendment. The party platforms timidly say: "by state enactment." That is what the present administration believes in. Apparently that was what Mr. Hughes believed in when he made his speech of acceptation. But overnight he changed his mind, and next day, despite his party's platform, came out resolutely for national amendment—which signifies very much. It must be admitted that Mr. Hughes' avowed reasons for supporting Women's Suffrage are not very complimentary—or judicial. "We've got to have it, anyway; let's take it with as little fuss as possible, and be done with it!" If he has no other reasons, however, this is a very good one. The reform is bound to come; no hand now can stay it; and all postponement means only a period of unwholesome social unrest. The sense of justice deferred is always a perilous ferment of civic mal-health, endangering all normality of social well-being. But is there any sane friend of humanity who would urge the hasty acceptance of a *wrong thing* because he believes it cannot be avoided? Behind President Wilson's opposition to national action in this matter stands a fundamental proposition of the Democratic Party for States' Rights. In this matter we think he is mistaken; but until he sees his mistake he is not likely to change his public attitude.

RELIGION AND TRUTH.

By Rev. James G. Townsend.

There is the need in all men and women of both religion and truth—religion to give hope, courage, ideals, aspiration, and truth to give a large, generous, and above all, a right conception of the universe of man, and of God. Truth or knowledge makes for health and happiness, both material and spiritual. Socrates, one of the world's great prophets and philosophers, made knowledge and goodness identical.

But religion is a matter of feeling, devotion, aspiration, prayer; truth is a matter of the intellect and the imagination, of science, philosophy and art. Religion cannot teach us what is truth, nor can science, philosophy and art, though they may possess a religious beauty, be made a substitute for *religion.*

Truth is reached through search, study, discovery, inference, logic, by the legitimate and persistent use of the intellect and the imagination, and in no other way. For the most part truth comes as the result of a long and painful evolution.

But religion will remain no mattter how far the horizon of truth be extended (and surely it shall be far)—there will always be the reaction of the spirit upon the world. So far as we have apprehended it, there will be this passion for the good, this desire for the beautiful, the soul trembling into tenderness and prayer.

Man, even the lowest and most ignorant, feels himself at times invaded by a great soul or presence and there is the desire to lose himself in this Infinity. Emotions, vast, palpitating, ineffable, sweep over him. He gives himself to wonder, worship, mystery, immortal dreams—to prayer—to *Religion.*

We may do many things in the homes we make and maintain for the training of our children, and what we call their education, and even their religion, by which we mean our own; yet this may be only as when we cut and train a vine, but do not fructify the roots or clear away the shadows that keep away the sun. The cutting and training may help the life; but the water and sunshine—these *are* the life.—Robert Collyer.

The Constructive Element in Religious Education

By Rev. H. H. Burch, *Bloomington, Ill.*

(Address delivered at Annual Meeting of Western Unitarian Conference at St. Louis, Mo., May 16, 1916.)

MY DESIRE in this paper is not so much to discuss methods of procedure in our system of religious education as to tell what I should like to see accomplished, and then to ask the specialists in religious education to tell me how to do these things.

First, I have discovered that the boys and girls, and young men and young women, and middle-aged men and middle-aged women, and old men and old women, with whom it is my privilege and pleasure to work, have all come into the world not absolutely free to formulate their own faiths or their own conceptions of truth, but rather the inheritors of the accumulated tendencies and temperaments of a thousand generations gone; and these generations without exception have been in the habit of identifying all truth with things, all religion with symbols. They had altars, tabernacles, Arks of the Covenant, holy places and sacred things in their minds. Hardness did not exist apart from hard things, roundness apart from round things, smoothness apart from smooth things. Of course, some of us got so old and wise after a while that we could take the crude little wooden block from the child's hands, and from its several faces, lines and angles, could draw dotted lines out even so far as the great square of Pegasus, and we could see not "A cube" nor "The cube" but just "Cube." But the most of us still think of hardness only as it describes an object—a stone, a brick or a beaten road. Now, in religion, we are beginning to ignore symbols, and when we look for help in modern philosophy we find Bergson defining metaphysics as the science without symbols, which, of course, is not true; and which, if it were true, would only be true long enough for the human imagination to run back to the dump heaps and bring up the same old symbolic molds and measures from mathematics, physics, chemistry and whatnot, and into these old molds we would pour our abstract thought. In the terminology of Bergson, played on a little by parody, we might still "intuit," but we would do our intuiting in lines and surfaces and squares and angles just the same. We were all born with symbols in our souls. This may sound reactionary, but I am persuaded that a religion that places the emphasis on mind that *our religion* does, should at least recognize the question that arises when an attempt is made to take all symbols from a symbol-loving race with the inherited weight of a thousand generations behind it. Have we provided anything that answers the place of symbol?

The ancients at least succeeded in identifying religion with things. I am not at all certain but there is great need of just that in our work. It is particularly true of boys and girls. They are strong believers in THINGS. They don't have to think back as far as René Descartes or Baruch Spinoza to find something unquestionably real. Unsophisticated by Bishop Berkeley, some of these boys and girls are even credulous enough to believe in the reality of the furniture of the very rooms they are themselves in. But there is something they cannot grasp. That is the abstract THINGNESS of Things. THINGNESS does not exist to the normal child or adult either. Most of them at some time have been badly frightened by the ghost of the infinitive, and they have taken refuge in the moated castle of the common noun or the present participle. They are strong believers in white houses, in sorrel horses, in green fields, and in singing birds, and in many other things besides, but just thing, or unsymbolized thingness, makes little or no appeal to their imagination.

I tried an interesting experiment with a group of boys and girls some time ago with the story of an elephant, except I told them it was not to be (an) elephant, or (the) elephant or even (a) elephant, but just elephant. It did not

take long to tell the story as you may well imagine. And then I said, "Now, will you tell me what I left out?" One fellow said, "The ears," another said "His legs," another said, "The trunk," another said, "O sir, you left out his sides and his back and his eyes." That class of critics fairly ruined my elephant story. Not long ago I was dated to give a talk to a boys' club on a "Real Snake Fight" I had witnessed in a Louisiana swamp. When I got there, the boys were fairly bristling with just one question. That question was the universal child's criticism of much of our religious pedagogy, "Were they REAL snakes?" True, we identify religion with good literature, with fine thought, with cultural mental moods, but the ancient identified religion with the dipper the devotee drank out of, and the railing he built about the top of his house, and the title to his land, and a lot of quite real things. I once played the game of "What is it?" with some of life's higher critics. John had come in and had said, "It's the name of something that swims." Joe said, "Does it live in the water?" "Yes," said John. "Does it ever get out of the water?" "No," said John. "Does it sing?" said Mary. "No," said John. "It is a fish." Then it was my turn. I said, "Now, boys and girls, I am thinking of something that is very real." Bob said, "Has it a voice?" I said, "No, it has no voice." Tom said, "Does it cast a shadow?" "No, it casts no shadow." "Does it wear boots?" "No, it has no legs." Tim said, "By jinks, that's dad's religion you're talking about."

Now, this, of course, is overdrawing the thing, but what I want to say is, that the average mind has got to see religion as it is identified with things. If our religious education fails to make that point of contact in the mind of the student, we fail. We need (A) religion, not just "religion." It must be something that relates to other things, that serves as a real factor in the coordination of experiences, it is hardly enough to say it is the group powers of the mind functioning correctly. That is equal to saying every man who is not insane is necessarily religious, and that is not true. I am not quarreling with the negatives of religious education; in a world of superstitions they are needed; but time itself can be trusted to destroy some outgrown things. When Jesus called the fishermen to follow him and be fishers of men, he didn't tell them to wait till they had destroyed their old boats and nets. The winds sweeping across the deserts of Assyria, the years beating with shadowed feet across the sundials in the garden of dying kings, the sands flowing through the hourglass, and even the flower calendars of old Pliny were all set for the destruction of every old boat and every old net. It was for them to put their hands and hearts to a great, new, positive thing. Their work was construction of men, and not destruction of boats. Our religious education needs to be revitalized by the presence of the everlasting yea. It needs to be taken out of the traditional department of pure reason, and carried over into the realms of practical reason. Kant uses two good words: "In a moral universe there *ought* to be a God, so let us act like there was one." The words "God" and "act" are the words that should have a large place in our system.

Literature abounds with illustrations, and philosophy from Plato to Bertrand Russel and Mr. Balfour is full of the human soul's need of a motive to act. A blind giant can pull down temples, a Sanballat can jeer at the builders, but King Solomon's name is identified with stately cedars of Lebanon marshaling themselves to the temple on Zion's hill.

I know of no better illustration of what I mean by (A) religion than the particular brand of Christmas religion that got old Scrooge. You know Scrooge really lived in the same world physically that little Nell and little Dorrit and Bob Cratchit did, but psychically he lived in a world that had been burned with a thousand fires and covered with frozen seas for a million years. He didn't need religion; he needed (A) religion, Easter religion would not have done for him, Thanksgiving religion was impossible to him, the particular kind he needed was Christmas religion. Scrooge lived in a world in which Charles Darwin was to hear the whispering of insects and beetles telling the secrets of life and being; in which Linnæus should discover the democracy of the flowers; in which Hugh Miller had found eternal truth with God's name signed in the rocks of Scotland; in which the best poetry had been sung by blind men, and whose mot-

ley throng of discordant voices, whose rolls of thunder and echoes of storm, had been translated into music by deaf men and cripples; in which the stars of night had courted the soul of Newton, and whose lightning had made love to Michael Farady; in which Shelley, the infidel, had heard and written the song of the skylark, drunk on the wine of the morning sun; and Byron, the clubfoot, had heard the laughter of the Gods rolling through the broken temples of primitive man.

In this most interesting world which had polished with passion the syllables of Burke, and pointed with sarcasm the laughter of Carlyle, and softened with the pastels of a thousand mornings the voice of John Ruskin; out of whose iron hills had been dug the bells which were now beating with mellow music on the gates of day, this world warm from the very center with the fires of a mysterious life, circled with the garments of mystic ocean, whose secrets charm scientists, whose problems challenge statesmen, whose despairs awaken all prophecy—in this world lived Scrooge, genius in the realm of wrath, an alien to the world of laughter, ninety-two million miles from the sun.

But the thing that changed Scrooge was a real thing. It was not "religion," it was A RELIGION—the religion of Christmas, the pathetic look on a crippled child's face, the patience of a faithful clerk, and the glad laughter of a living man's voice.

I am attempting to say that religious education, to be vital, to be worth while, and to be constructive, must be something real; so real that when a skeptical scientist says, "What is it that makes these two parts of hydrogen unite with this one part of oxygen?" and "What makes these steel filings follow the magnet?" he will be equally interested in the force which operates to institutionalize into a cultus, to fashion a temple dome round, to paint a minaret blue, to put a cross yonder and a crescent there; to organize a whole race of men about the consciousness of Deity, to plant the seed of universal democracy in the daydreams of a hungry man on a housetop in Joppa; to build reverence or truth in human minds which outlasts falsehood.

I would emphasize reverence here. Reverence is religion's hand on the human mind. It may be credulous superstition producing a fetish here and a voodoo doctor there; but if it enables a herdsman in Midian to take off his shoes in the presence of a deep mystery, and then put them on again and go down to the mud pits of Egypt to deliver his people from bondage, it has its place. The psychology of Moses' vision of the bush is that action is identical with reverence, and great industrial movements sometimes travel in the chariot of dreams.

The important thing is, not that Haeckel finally finds the soul to be nought but the life spark of an atom or a cell—the important thing is, when he finds that, has he still the power to bow his head? The important thing is, not that the old is passing, but is there a new coming? And when we stand in the presence of an "Infinite Plus," no longer able to say our prayers aloud, can we still stand with bowed head and reverent thought?

I want my religious education to be constructive in its fine reverence for truth as truth is seen in things, for life as life builds in people, and shall have no fear even though institutions are produced, and a cultus with a cultus-consciousness result, if it be that faith is kept with this present world, and reverence abide in the human spirit.

HARD LINES.

De hottes' Sunday in de yeah,
  De preachuh say, "Le's pray
Fuh dem in peril on de sea;"
  An' widout yea or nay,
You gotter drap down on yo' knees,
  En wuk yo' nether lip,
En ax de preserbation uv
  De folks whar's bo'ad a ship,
Whar cool win's blow, en sails is spread,
  En eve'ything is prime,
En deys enjoyin' uv deysefs
  De whole en livelong time.

Hit makes me hot en mad clar thoo
  To haveter was'e my bref
On folks dat's whar dey want to be,
  Whilst only you is lef'
To wuk en sweat dese summah days,
  En pray fuh dem dat's gone
To have a heap mo' bettuh time,
  Den you is evuh done.

—Cally Ryland.

A Man's Size Religion

By The Editor.

I WAS NOT born a Unitarian, and I did not come into the Unitarian Church because I wanted to come, but because I had to come. The microbe of heresy got into my system when I was in college, and I fought it hard and tried to strangle it. I was afraid of the "chill and bleakness" of the liberal faith, as I had heard it spoken of; and so sought a way to compromise through "liberal orthodoxy" at Andover Theological Seminary. But that wouldn't do. The honor of my intellectual self-respect demanded straight dealing with the things of religion, so I went to the divinity school of Harvard University to venture the hazards of Unitarianism—and found; instead of "chill and bleakness," a splendid eagerness of spiritual fire, a robust fullness of constructive and fructifying faith—spacious, man's size—to meet the utter bigness of my nature's utmost lift of aspiration.

In defining Unitarianism, let me put at the threshold the phrase already used: "*the honor of intellectual self-respect.*" That is what Unitarianism primarily means; the mind's stalwart insistence for straight dealing with the enormously important concerns which religion involves. There shall be no stoop of the intellect, no demeaning of conscience in the approach of the soul to life's fundamental problems; a man's size religion or none at all shall be demanded for modern faith.

I.

Let me put first in our essential creed something that may seem inanely platitudinous: *We believe in the truthfulness of truth.* Of course! Why use such a silly truism? But realize what it means. We believe that truth can stand being put to the test; we have robust faith that the final verity of being is so good that there is nothing to be afraid of in the hazard of ruthless truthseeking. We believe that we live in a rational universe, souled by a rational God. The most pitiful infidelity in the world is the faith that is afraid—dares not ask questions about itself—but hides behind creeds for protecting breastworks and scurries to dogmas for safe retreats. Because we dare trust truth to the utmost, we dare trust God's gift of reason stalwartly; we will not accept for religion any tradition or parrot-repeated symbol that involves anything abhorrent to the mind's full bigness of ethical ideal or rational vision. Therefore, we recognize science, and philosophy and history as co-partners with theology in the method of truth-seeking, and we leave to each soul its own responsibility of creed formulation. Whatever helps to the knowledge of reality helps to the mastery of the truth of God.

II.

In the second place, *we believe in the justice of justice.* This, too, sounds like a silly platitude. But the tragic catastrophe of too much that has passed for religion has been the conception of a Divine justice immeasurably unjust. According to barbaric notions, justice simply means that when anybody does a good thing for you, you must give him a reward; but if anybody does a bad thing to you, you must hit back at him—hurt him all you can. It is this vindictive conception of justice, magnified to the "righteousness of God," that has brought woeful mischief into the ancient creeds. For it is the vindictive factor that dominates. The "reward" side of justice has never counted for very much in practical religion. Honestly, the bliss of heaven as conventionally presented is too tame and insipid to prove much of a "prize" just of itself, to lure men to salvation. It is rather the fear of the vengeance, horror of the Divine method of "hitting back" that has put stamina in past ideas of the "justice of God."

The Unitarian repudiates absolutely this barbaric conception of justice. We insist that vindictiveness is just as ignoble a motive for Divine action as for human action. Justice is not a scheme of rewards and vengeances. It is fundamentally a principle of achieving good will; insistence that every soul of life have full chance to attain its utmost possibility of being, unhindered by any other soul, but rather helped by every other soul the universe contains. And God is the universal soul of good will eternally urging for the triumph of such justice. For note what good will means. It is not self-cen-

tered will, isolated in its self-seeking; it is the will that impels everything that is to find significance and satisfaction, not in what it is of itself, but in what it is in relation to other than itself; and God, the together-making glory of the whole, which is the reason of being. When you take out of religion the barbarously vindictive factor of false justice and find instead the unremitting passion of good will, you forever vacate the dogmas and traditions which divide and antagonize the sects, bewilder human understanding, and arrest the progress of the church universal in the timidities of superstitions.

III.

And third, Unitarians believe in the everywhere-present and immediately intimate relationship between the soul of the universe, whom we call God, and the life of each individual human being. This means that revelation is more significantly a matter of present tense than of past tense. The mistake of the fathers has been to stress overmuch the significance of past tense revelations in prophetships and scriptures. These have their place when rationally interpreted, but essential revelation is more than these. God is not a far-away potentate, who can get word to his people only by mediating plenipotentiaries extraordinary, now and then, or through official communications written in a code that has to be translated. In truer sense God lives in the same universe with ourselves—near neighbor to our daily living, that the whisperings of his intimate voice may be daily heard, will we only heed them, the writings of his Scriptures freshly graven, the touch of his communicating hand meeting familiarly the flesh of our own as we toil side by side with him at creation's common work bench.

For instance, we believe that God's revelation through nature is more nobly to be heeded than in times past; and not simply nature in her poetic aspects, beauty of sunsets, and wonder of sea visions and mystery of forest silences, and the like. But when the scientist poises microscope to study the habits of molecules and atoms, or astronomer ranges the stars with curious telescope, or biologist studies the secrets of evolving life cells—in every case it is writ of the eternal life that is being deciphered, it is the palpitating glory of the universal reality that is being revealed. And science is no longer cold and heartless; it is aglow with splendid reverence and vigor of faith when most vitally achieving.

So all that mystery which we call genius in literature and art—as acutely ennobling in the world today as in any age past—what is it but akin to whatever was in ancient seers and prophets to reveal in the living word of great-souled men the living thought and purpose of a present-tense God—who lives and moves within men's souls more truly than outside of them. So the accumulating experience of the race in what we call history is part of the revelation of essential truth. More or less, all generations of men have believed all this in a sort of poetic way. The Unitarian dares take it all seriously. The vital fact of religion is not past tense, but present tense. A God who lives at the same time that we live must not find his only way of speaking to us through the meagre memories of careers lived long ago.

IV.

What about Christ? Some people can give you slickly a three-word definition of Unitarianism. Unitarians are the people, they say, "who deny Christ," who do not believe in the deity of the Son of God. But what do those who say they believe in the deity of Christ actually believe themselves, on the honor of their intellectual self-respect? Did you ever try to think it through? Do you mean that at one set period of historic time all that deity is in all the universes was withdrawn from other habitations to be confined exclusively in one human form that walked the streets of Nazareth? Do you mean that when Jesus grew faint from hunger or exhausted with toil, or depressed in discouragement, or angered at opposition, it was all the deity that is in all the universes that was involved in those experiences? When Jesus prayed on the hillsides, was it just God talking to himself without the passion of prayer's wrestling? When Jesus battled with his despondency at Gethsemane, was it God crying "If it be possible take this cup from me?" When Jesus moaned upon the cross, "My God, my God! why hast thou forsaken me!" was that the despair of the eternal one?

"No," you answer, immediately. I am travestying the dogma of the incarnation

in saying all this. But then, what is meant? Why, that in some sense not easy to be explained, in the living of Jesus the very living of God was actually involved; that though "all that deity is" was not locally compressed in that human experience, yet in that experience lived triumphantly the essential fulness of the very nature of God; as though on a cloudy day all at once at one spot the clouds break and the sky shows clearly through the cloud. We do not indeed see the whole sky there, but all that we see there is actually sky. So in the living of Jesus the infinite beauty and being of eternal God is manifest uniquely and as never before; it is God incarnate in human flesh and dwelling amongst men. Is not this what most Trinitarians believe about the deity of Christ?

Shall I surprise you by saying that with one significant qualification this is precisely what Unitarians believe? I mean that to the degree in which Jesus supremely achieved the ideal of human perfection, to the degree in which his life escaped all isolating selfishness and triumphed in the purity of utter goodwill, to that degree he achieved oneship with God. God lived in him effectually, God walked the earth in very presence. Only Unitarians insist in having the whole bigness of this Christly faith—that it be not restricted to one local experience. In every age and race, to the degree in which any human soul achieves supremely in the measure of ideal humanity, escapes isolating selfishness to attain the purity of self-sacrificing goodwill, to that degree that soul acquires oneship with God, incarnates deity, reveals the glory of the eternal Divine. That in its essence is precisely what humanity means! We have it poor and partial in our present actual experience—it has not yet attained its ideal possibilities. The story of its growth is the story of elemental evolution. But the process of its growth is the process of achieving oneship with the will of God, of more and more incarnating the life of the eternal.

The most real fact about God is the achievement of his humanity, which Christianship really means. In this sense Unitarians more logically and inspiringly believe in Christ than any other people in the world. The beauty of the life lived in Nazareth becomes symbol of the infinitely unrestricted glory of the whole meaning of Godhood hid in humanity, but it must be rationally interpreted and meet the test of ruthless scholarship and reason—the honor of intellectual self-respect.

V.

Let me thus sum up our fundamental faiths:

I. We believe in God, the soul of eternal goodwill within all being, making everything that is have significance, not in what it is of itself, but in what it is in relation to other than itself.

II. We believe in the essential divinity of the human soul—that germ of eternal destiny which, to the degree in which it attains its own ideal, incarnates God and shares in his divinity.

III. We believe in the essential Christship—God forever manifest in humanity, and ever more perfectly manifest as more completely human life attains its own destiny of perfection.

IV. We believe in the continuous and everywhere present revelation of the divine in human experience, through science, literature, art, history and the growing impulse of philanthropic progress.

V. We believe in the progress of immortality, onward and upward forever.

A PRAYER.

O Thou most holy and ever-loving God, we thank Thee once more for the quiet rest of the night that has gone by, for the new promise that has come with this fresh morning, and for the hope of this day. While we have slept, the world in which we live has swept on in its awful space, great fires have burned under us, great waters have been all about us, and great storms above us; but Thou hast held them back by Thy strong hand, and we have rested under the shadow of Thy love. The bird sat on the spray out in the darkness, the flower nestled in the grass, we lay down in our home, and all slept in the arms of God. The bird will trust Thee this day to give its morsel of meat, and the flower will trust Thee for its fresh raiment; so may we trust Thee this day for all the needs of the body, the soul, and the spirit. Give us this day our daily bread. Amen.—Robert Collyer.

Modern Religious Movements in India

By J. T. SUNDERLAND, D. D.

IF SOME one equal to the task would give us a book on Modern Religious Movements in America, dealing with the causes that produced them and their real significance in the religious thought and life of our New World, he would meet a need. It is hard to conceive of a more interesting, a more living or a more suggestive theme. I wonder that no writer has undertaken to cover this fascinating field.

A field hardly less wide or rich is that of "Modern Religious Movements" in India, the subject of a new book (Macmillan, 1915, pp. 471. Price $2.50 net) by J. N. Farquhar, M. A., who has been for the past twenty years a missionary, lecturer and teacher in Calcutta and elsewhere in India, and who is the author of two or three other works on Indian subjects.

For 3,000 years India has been preeminently a land of religious thinkers. Indeed no other country in the world, unless we except Palestine, has had anything like so important a place in the religious history of mankind as the land of the Hindus.

The western world has long thought of Asia as asleep. Twenty or thirty years ago we found to our surprise that this conception was no longer true of Japan. Recently we have been finding that it has ceased to be true of China. At no distant day we shall discover that we must also make an exception of India. Indeed this discovery ought to have been made by us long before now. Today the land is one of newspapers, new books, discussion, eagerness for education, congresses and conferences of almost every kind, political, religious, social and industrial. A great new *Renaissance* is already well begun in India.

This Renaissance takes primarily two forms, one political and the other religious.

The political awakening began early last century, very slowly and gradually, with no particular leadership, with no unity, with no very definite end in view. But as time went on it gradually acquired unity, cohesion, definiteness of purpose and strength, especially within the last thirty years. Now this political awakening may be said to have gathered under its influence nearly all the leading minds of the country, of every party and religious faith, and it has come to have as its one clear and almost universally accepted aim the restoration of India once more, as in ages past, to a place among the great and influential nations of the world. This does not mean necessarily separation from the British Empire, but it does mean a new and more important place for India in that empire.

The religious awakening of India began quite as early as the political. In some quarters it has proceeded as fast and as far, but it does not have so definite an end in view. Indeed, while its influence is great and increasing, it is broken, divergent, wanting in unity, in some quarters powerfully conducive to enlightenment and progress but in others strongly reactionary.

It is to be noted that the author of the book before us confines himself to "Modern Religious Movements," and therefore that he excludes from his treatment all the old historic religions of India, or religions of long standing, namely, Hinduism (or Brahmanism), Buddhism, Jainism, Zoroastrianism (or Parsiism) and Mohammedanism, except as regards such later developments of these faiths as fall within the past century or so, that is: since the year 1800. He also excludes Christianity. At this we somewhat wonder, for although it is true that Christianity in a very corrupt form (the Christian church of the "Syrian Rite") is ancient in India, having existed in the southwest since the third or fourth century, and that Roman Catholicism has been in the land since the time of Xavier in the sixteenth century, yet Protestantism and such developments of Christianity as have interested themselves in enlightenment, in education, in social reforms, in sanitation and medical aid, in

uplifting women, and in bringing to India the progressive civilization of Europe and America—these are almost all truly "modern," falling within the period since 1800. I suspect, perhaps without foundation, that the real reason why the author omits Christianity may be that he expects later to give us a volume devoted to Christianity alone, as he has already given us two volumes on Hinduism. If this is his purpose, and if the coming book shall be written with as much intelligence and in as broad a spirit as are manifested in the present work, it will be a welcome addition to the rather abundant but not very satisfactory literature which we already possess on Indian Christian missions and their results.

It should be said of Mr. Farquhar's book that, notwithstanding its omissions or limitations, the ground it covers is larger than its title seems to indicate. Of his six chapters only three are devoted to strictly "religious" subjects. The other three give us (I) a "Historic Outline" (or brief general history) of the period that the book covers (1800 to 1913); (II) an account of the rise, progress and present status of Indian "Nationalism," or the national movement for political reform in India, and (III) a description of the various movements of "Social Reform" which have arisen during the last century. Thus us have in the work a comprehensive survey of practically everything of most importance outside of Christian missions that has been going on in India for a hundred years, not only in the strictly religious field but also the fields of political, social and educational progress. Most readers will be glad that the author has given his work this broad scope, for his *extra*-religious chapters, especially that on Social Reforms, are by no means the least interesting and valuable part of the volume.

The three chapters of the book dealing with movements strictly religious have the following titles, which very well describe their purport.

I. Movements Favoring Serious Reform—that is: favoring reform as understood by the Christian world.

II. Reform Checked by Defense of the Old Faiths—that is: reform movements (so-called) which, in the author's judgment, are so closely allied to the old faiths and the old superstitions as to be only slightly, if at all, effective as real reforms.

III. Full Defense of the Old Religions—that is: distinctly reactionary movements, or movements designed not to reform the old faiths but to defend and strengthen them as they now exist.

Of the movements which mean real reform Mr. Farquhar places the Brahmo Samaj first and foremost. Indeed he tells us that he regards the Brahmo Samaj as quite the most important religious movement produced in the nineteenth century. This is not on account of its numerical strength, for it numbers only about 180 societies in all India, but its leaders have been men of such commanding ability, such high character and such profound piety, its ethical and religious principles have been so lofty, the educational and social reforms it has inaugurated have been so significant, and the ideals of individual and national life it has lifted up have been so noble, that it has attracted attention and become a moral power throughout the land. While it has been too radical and too advanced a movement to draw to itself large numbers of adherents, it has lifted up a standard, it has blazed a path, it startled and stimulated public thought, and caused the inauguration of movements less radical which have done much to carry out its ideals. Reforms of many kinds are springing up in India which acknowledge no connection with the Brahmo Samaj but which as a fact have been furthered if not initiated by the thought and the example of that pioneer body.

More and more India is coming to accept Ram Mohan Roy, the founder of the Brahmo Samaj, as her greatest son of the last two centuries. It is significant that Professor J. C. Bose, India's most distinguished living scientist, and Rabindranath Tagore, her greatest living poet, and such eminent public leaders as Justice Ranade and Mr. A. M. Bose, are Brahmos. Of the twenty-two portraits of eminent Indians that Mr. Farquhar places in his volume, seven are of Brahmos, and two others are of men who at one time were Brahmos and who received from the Brahmo Samaj their spiritual awakening and their impulse toward reform.

The account which the author gives of the Brahmo Samaj movement and of its

most distinguished leaders, Ram Mohan Roy, Dubendranath Tagore, Keshub Chunder Sen and Mr. Mozoomdar, is reasonably full, carefully written, and on the whole, very fair and appreciative—as appreciative as we could possibly expect from one who is himself not a Brahmo and who finds it difficult to believe that ethical and spiritual religion of a high quality can come from any source but Christianity. Indeed one of the weaknesses of the book is seen in the fact that whenever the author finds such high spiritual religion, as he freely confesses he does in Brahmoism and in a few other quarters, he nearly or quite always seeks to explain it as really originating, immediately or remotely, in Christian sources. It is plain that he has come much in contact with the Brahmo Samaj, and sincerely admires its leaders, its piety, most of its principles and its practical work. About all the criticism of it that he seems able to make is that it is not willing to call itself Christian.

Of the less radical movements of religious reform in India (those described under the heading of "Reforms Checked by Defense of the Old Faiths") the first place is given to the Arya Samaj. This important movement is treated at considerable length, but not so sympathetically, and therefore hardly as fairly, as the Brahmo Samaj. The Arya Samaj is distinctly theistic in its character, opposed to idolatry, opposed to the tyrannies of caste, opposed to child marriage, friendly to science and favorable to education for both sexes. It is somewhat like the Brahmo Samaj only more conservative. If we call the Brahmo Samaj the Unitarianism of India, we may well call the Arya Samaj the Liberal Orthodoxy of India. It is less than half as old as the Brahmo Samaj, but it his already outstripped that body in the number of its adherents. The explanation of this seems to be its less radical, less advanced nature. To join it requires a less serious break with the old faiths. It is growing fast and is becoming very influential, though it cannot yet be described as any such light in the land as the Brahmo Samaj is and has long been.

Under reactionary religious movements in India, or movements for "Defense of the Old Faiths," Mr. Farquhar gives us a very extended account of Theosophy; indeed he devotes more space to this subject than to any other in his book. We rather wonder at this, when we consider that the Theosophical movement had its origin in New York and not in India, that its claims have been repudiated by many Hindu leaders, that its strength in India is not large, and that as a fact it seems to have met with most favor in the West rather than in the East. The author recognizes some good in Theosophy, but believes that it contains much more superstition than truth, much more evil than good. His treatment of it takes largely the form of a detailed exposure of the tricks and deceptions by means of which, as he believes, and as the many facts cited would seem to substantiate, Madame Blavatsky, the originator of the movement, obtained her following, and the subsequent deceptions and pretensions employed to bolster up the claims which the movement puts forth.

Such is as full an account as space permits of a very interesting book. I do not know of any other single volume that even approximates this as a portrayal of what is most important in the religious and social life of the India of today and the religious and social changes of the past hundred years. The author manifests two biases, as already intimated. He sees all religious men and events through the eyes of a Christian, and all political men and events through the eyes of an Englishman, or an American with English sympathies. If he were a native of India he would represent some religious matters, some social matters and some political matters distinctly differently. And yet nothing is more clear than that he tries to be fair and just. And generally he has succeeded to a very gratifying degree. He has written a timely and valuable work.

There is always some good fruit, soon or late, from the blossoming in every one of us—just as much as we could carry, perhaps, if we could only fathom the whole secret. And so we should no more doubt God's providence because so much of the promise has fallen dead around us than we doubt Nature's providence as she snows down her overplus of blossom about the roots of the trees.—Robert Collyer.

A Baptist Sidelight

In a certain large and influential Southern city there is a large and influential Baptist church, which had the good fortune of a wide-awake and winsome layman who for a number of years has been teacher of a large Baraca Class of young men, of the sort to bring delight to any enterprising pastor. And the cordial sympathy of former pastors of the church has buttressed the good work of this teacher, despite the fact that his point of view has been rather more modern and "rationalistic" than many Baptists deem orthodox. Everything went well, until a recently called new pastor discovered "discord" between what he was preaching from the pulpit and what this layman was teaching in the Baraca Class. Whereupon the teacher was invited to resign in such a manner as constituted virtual dismissal.

The teacher himself, we understand, entered no troublesome protest; but the matter was vigorously taken up by a member of the church and class, and we are permitted to publish a letter directed to the pastor, which surely makes interesting reading in more ways than one to Unitarian people. We omit names for obvious reasons:

My dear Dr. X:

It has been on my mind to write to you ever since I heard that Mr. E. had acted on your request for his resignation as teacher of the Baraca Class. My views are uninvited, and perhaps undesired, but I shall feel more comfortable after a frank statement of my position.

To begin with, your action has seemed to me to be ill-advised, taking into consideration the equation of the personal loyalty of the Class to Mr. E. One cannot labor for many years as faithfully and acceptably as he has done without creating very strong ties of personal affection and loyalty, which must be very tactfully considered. Had you been thoroughly fortified in the grounds for your action, the method adopted must inevitably have resulted in misunderstanding and misconstruction, of more or less serious consequence.

Without underestimating the strategical importance of doing even the right thing *in the right way*, I feel that you have been even more ill-advised in the thing itself that you have done. That you may know the grounds of my judgment in the matter, I wish to state briefly my understanding of the facts in this case.

You felt that Mr. E. and yourself had certain conflicting views relative to certain church and denominational doctrines, and that his work in the Sunday school was therefore negativing your work in the pulpit. This would obviously create a situation of much embarrassment if the points on which you differed were fundamental and one or the other of you were categorically right or wrong. My understanding is that the points that constituted your differences of opinion were, (1) your respective interpretations of the nature and attributes of Deity; (2) your respective views on the nature of future punishment; (3) your respective views on evangelism; and perhaps as a fourth point, (4) your respective views as to your own position as conclusive authority on all the above issues.

I am not so much concerned, primarily, as to the details of your respective views on the first three matters, as I am as to your assumption of authority to decide for the members of your congregation the details of their faith and doctrine. As a Baptist and as a Protestant, I flatly deny the validity of any such priestly prerogative. To hold the contrary is to make a most unwarrantable assumption. No Baptist minister has ever been clothed with such power and our own church covenant expressly provides that the Scriptures (not the priest) are to constitute our rule of faith and guidance. For you therefore to impose your personal views as the straight edge and form by which to test the "orthodoxy" of your congregation, besides being an astoundingly egotistical assumption, is a reversion to a system of ecclesiastical authority which all Protestantism has repudiated for all time. Had Mr. E. been in fact charged with the most flagrant departures from the doctrines commonly held by Baptists, you would have in no case been constituted his judge.

But, leaving this point, which is to my mind of the most fundamental importance, I should like to challenge frankly and emphatically your own views on the matters in dispute between yourself and Mr. E. I have heard your message, as preached from the pulpit, a great many times. Leaving out the adjectives, it is the message of a pagan deity, capable of actions which in a man would be grossly immoral and reprehensible, who has instituted a certain mechanical contrivance for "salvation" of those otherwise predestined to eternal punishment in a place of certain material equipment for inflicting physical torture throughout eternity. The ruling passions of your God are pride and conceit; he delights in the grovelling subservience of his creatures; and if he does not get it in the fullest measure he visits the fruits of his piqued rage in a very competent series of excruciating torture.

Any sincere opinion is to be respected as such, but, whatever happiness you may personally get out of loyalty to such a horrible creation, I, of course, reserve the right to repudiate it for myself as sacrilege and blasphemy, and to further repudiate any such abortion as being the accepted faith of Christendom in general, and as Baptists in particular. Such a God goes very well with mediæval racks and thumb screws, but he is

absurdly anachronistic today, and I should myself hesitate long before venturing to insult my own God with any such caricatures of His character. I love my God. I despise yours.

Please do not misunderstand my purpose. I cannot hope to "convert" you to my way of thinking. Jesus knew the limitations of human faith: "Ye must be born again" into right relations both to God and to men. These little man-made (passion-made) mechanical creeds that you advocate are not insincere. Caliban was not insincere in his fear of the "awfulness" of an irresponsible quick-tempered, vengeful deity. But neither Caliban nor yourself "have seen the Father," or felt the entrancing wonder of His love. You have both created God in the likeness of your own morbid fears, limited horizons and defective faith.

Do not imagine that I am writing this without the most careful consideration of the personal hurt it must inevitably cause you. Unlike your God, I have no pleasure in the suffering of those who fail to agree with me. If your views were your private concern I should feel sorry indeed that you had missed so completely the sustaining joy of a higher faith, but I should not risk wounding your pride by such a letter. But you are the steward of a great opportunity, which, in your pride of opinion and spiritual blindness, you are fast dissipating.

I do not know of a greater tragedy than that being worked out before my eyes today. You have an opportunity for real service that makes one tremble with the thought of its potentialities. A magnificent temple of worship; a really great congregation; a city in touch with all the world—what a field to till for the glory of God and the blessing of mankind!

Do these things constitute no challenge to your humility, to your sense of responsibility? Do you never wonder whether you are really doing God's will, or only what, in the capacity of adviser to God, you would have suggested that He do? Do you ever wonder whether you have not circumscribed God's purpose within the limits of your own personal vision? Has the horror of the question never suggested itself as to whether you are not proclaiming as the God of all the universe, the mere projected image of your own rather morbid egotism? Do you really never hear the trumpet call of the Church's new definition of service? Is your social consciousness already atrophied and dead? Or is the challenge of the manifold problem of human need too full of "dangerous" alternatives? Is it that you would rather preach "safely" a dead message than take the inevitable consequences of commitment to a live one? Frankly, I do not think you have made this unworthy choice. You have just not had your vision.

What I would finally say is this: I flatly deny that your views are the views of the Baptist denomination or of this Baptist Church. I challenge you at any time, in any fair way, to put that denial to the test. I am not questioning your power to work up a little administration caucus and close the doors to all further discussion. That has been an easy thing for unscrupulous priests to do always, though not always with wholly satisfactory consequences. I do not, however, charge you with baseness or with insincerity. I charge you with error, error the most serious and the most hurtful to the cause of Christ. I charge you with absolute misrepresentation of the faith and doctrine you profess to teach. Do you dare, at any time or place, to meet the challenge of that charge?

I am, Very truly yours,

THE WORK IN THE COLLEGE TOWNS.

The Young People's Religious Union is a missionary body—that is to say, it exists to spread a gospel. And of all the fields for its missionary endeavors, perhaps the most important are the educational centres, where large numbers of young men and women are seeking exactly the sort of religion that Unitarians have to offer. To make every effort to carry our gospel to these young people is our bounden duty.

For this work in the college towns, we have a definite and well-tried method. We supply the minister of the Unitarian church with funds to engage the services of a "student-assistant," whose duties are to go about among his fellow students and make known the purpose and programme of the Unitarian church. This plan has proved successful in the past, as our college-town ministers have freely testified; and we hope to continue it during the coming year.

Obviously, the extent to which the Young People's Religious Union can carry on this missionary enterprise will depend upon its financial resources. Last year we were shamefully handicapped by lack of funds; and unless we receive increased assistance, we shall not be able to do what cries out to be done this year. Through the generosity of many friends gathered at Star Island last month, $149 has been raised to date. We need to double that sum by September 15; and we appeal to all Unitarian young people —young in years, young in heart—to help carry forward this piece of constructive denominational service. Contributions, large or small, should be sent to the treasurer, Mr. O. Arthur McMurdie, 25 Beacon street, marked for Student Assistant work.

FREDERICK M. ELIOT,
President.

A Tentative Plan for Church Progress

By Ralph J. Patterson

[*EDITOR'S NOTE: The following article, which was delivered as an address at a recent local Conference by a prominent layman, is here published, not necessary with endorsement of its rather unusual and radical propositions, but as an interesting illustration of how some active lay minds in our midst are working, and as a challenge for thought to those of our readers who are interested in the question: How could we do things differently, and make them better?*]

THE MOST urgent problem in the religious world today is not the revision of the creeds of Christendom, nor the restatement of ancient theological doctrines, nor the reconciliation of faith and science. It is, "How shall we create and spread abroad widely among men a clearer understanding and deeper conviction of the need and worth of the church as an institution?" It ought to become a part of our daily life and be in harmony with the devices and desires of the personality that lies within us; instead, reconstruction of theology goes on apace but public interest in the church lessens from year to year.

If this revival of public interest could be accomplished without interfering with your past, present or future religious convictions and beliefs, would you be willing to help promote such a plan?

It has been stated in a newspaper report of a Catholic Convention that there are 50,000,000 people in this country unaffiliated with any church and that is nearly one-half the total population. Considered as a business proposition, if you had a line of goods that fifty million people needed and would probably use if properly introduced, it is more than likely, especially if you had a practical monopoly of the commodity, that you would find some way to get at these prospective customers even at the risk of making some mistakes in doing it. The remedy here offered for your consideration, contemplates the classification of the church, following somewhat after the way of the Y. M. C. A., into associate members, active members and communicants. Some such classification is necessary to the success of the plan as it will appear later. This is not thought to be an insurmountable difficulty. All advocates of church federation call attention to the fact that the evil forces of mankind are all banded together into compact and comprehensive organizations, and the only way left is for churches to forget petty differences and concentrate in one supreme effort to become more effective in human life, thus to create a wide, deep conviction among people in general that the church is a supreme necessity.

If you can agree with these statements and consent to the slight modification in membership that has been suggested, we are prepared to consider the other part of the plan, which simply adds something to what the church already has and takes nothing away. Lest you may be tempted to question the success or practicability of these plans, it may be stated that they are in successful operation outside of the church all around us every day and the only question involved is whether you want to do business with your 50,000,000 prospects or not.

The Plan.

The church extension work is to be carried along by an allied institution that may be called the *Cooperative Church Confederation*, which may be divided into departments as follows:

Fraternal Department.
Savings and Loan Department.
Employment Department.

Let us first consider the organization required of the churches necessary to carry out this plan.

Church Organization.

It will be noticed that the requirement of membership in the churches is necessary in order to belong to either the Fraternal Department or the Savings Department of the Confederation, the aim being to create interest in church affairs in this way. Three distinct classes of members are required in the churches,

associate members, having no voting power; active members and communicants who control the organizations. The treasurer of the Cooperative Church Confederation should have charge of certain record books belonging to each of the churches joining in the federation called Associate Members Registers and Active Members Registers, in which admitted members should sign their names.

Associate Members Registers should contain the statement over the signatures that the undersigned, being of more than certain stipulated years of age, and desirous of obtaining further knowledge of the objects and aims of this church and of participating in the benefits of membership in the Fraternal Department of the Cooperative Church Confederation, hereby agrees to pay to the treasurer of the church one dollar in dues annually on the first Monday in January of each year. No other statement or qualification should be required of Associate Members.

Active Members Registers should contain the statement that the undersigned, being of more than certain stipulated years of age and being desirous of becoming a voting member of this church and of participating in the benefits of the Savings and Loan Department of the Cooperative Church Confederation, hereby agrees to pay to the treasurer of the church the sum of two dollars in dues on the second Monday of January of each year.

Active members must be of good character and be recommended as such by at least three voting members of the church owning the register. These registers may contain such other information as may be deemed useful, such as occupation, age, residence, etc. The controlling body of the church owning the register shall, after this form of application has been made, vote to accept or reject, or better still, applications could be filed with the minister or through him and the vote taken before the register is signed. These registers should be accessible at all times to members and applicants.

Communicant Members Registers should be, and remain in, the hands of the church officials, and communicants are not required to sign either of the other registers unless they may wish to do so, but are eligible to membership in the Cooperative Church Confederation without so doing. Communicants are the worthiest members of the church, having accepted its beliefs and doctrines in accordance with the prescribed rites and ceremonies and are of course entitled to all the rights and privileges of other members in every way; may become members of the Cooperative Church Confederation without further recommendation and may not be required to pay dues to the church. Communicants are also entitled to participate in the division of the annuity fund to be provided upon reaching the age of sixty years and having been in good standing in the church for twenty years, upon application for the privilege in due form.

COOPERATIVE CHURCH CONFEDERATION.

The organization of the Cooperative Church Confederation should be very carefully planned and executed. There is a need of a broad, comprehensive constitution and suitable by-laws. The whole should be divided into two or perhaps three departments as previously stated. The general meeting should elect an advisory board which should choose a president, vice-president and treasurer, and these officers should be salaried, the advisory board itself serving without pay. The general meeting should also elect a committee of credits, a committee of discounts, and a committee of fraternal benefits, which committee should also serve without pay, employing only such clerical assistance as may be necessary.

Voting members of churches represented are the only persons qualified to vote at the general meeting except that associate members may vote in the election of the committee of fraternal benefits, whose duty will be to pass upon claims of beneficiaries.

The Fraternal Department may be organized and conducted after the fashion of the Pilgrim Fraternal Association of the Pilgrim Congregational Church of Dorchester, Mass., or like some of the more pretentious societies organized for a similar purpose.

Briefly, the plan of the Pilgrim Fraternal Association is as follows: It was organized in February, 1893, with thirty charter members. Its three specific aims were: first, to cultivate social intercourse between the men of the church and the congregation; second, by the agency of a mutual benefit fund to relieve those who might be in need, and to aid in cases of

sickness and death; third, to promote a warmer interest in the work and welfare of the church. It has never needed to be reorganized; has never taken a backward step; has never stood still for one moment, but has progressed steadily from the beginning. In eighteen years up to 1911 it has paid out over $3,500 for relief and in sick and death benefits, had $1,800 in its treasury and a membership of 150 men. It cost one dollar to join and the dues were fifty cents per month for eight months of the year. The benefits were $5.00 per week in sickness (paid out in accordance with by-laws); relief to the extent of $25 per year in case of financial distress and $50 to nearest relatives in case of death.

Regular meetings were held on the first Monday evening of each month from October to May inclusive, eight months. Program: Short business session followed by some pleasing form of entertainment, closing with a simple free collation. There was also the annual address by some eminent speaker, and ladies' night, an annual affair in June, which is described as the crowning event of the year in capital letters.

The contributors to this department should not be entitled to vote at the general meetings for the election of officers and directors unless they are also shareholders of the Savings and Loan Department, but may have a voice in matters pertaining entirely to business in which they are interested outside of elections and in the election of the members of the committee of Fraternal Benefits. The intention of this paper is merely to outline things that may be done, and so we may now consider the financial department, called the Savings and Loan Department.

The Savings and Loan Department is essentially a cooperative banking and loan association and needs to be organized and conducted after the manner of similar institutions. The following extract from the report of former Bank Commissioner, Hon. W. B. Skelton, in regard to loan and building associations will convey an idea of what these are like. He says:

"I have taken occasion in the past to speak of the value of these institutions, both to their members and to the public in general. There is a feeling that if this fact were more generally understood, growth would be much more rapid. They occupy a unique position, encroaching but little upon the field of banking institutions. Their direct benefits are two-fold. In the first place, the system of small regular payments upon the principal and interest of loans, made at stated intervals, enables them to safely advance a much larger percentage of the total value of the security offered than could otherwise be done. Thus persons regularly employed but of small means may, by availing themselves of the assistance of a loan and building association, acquire a home by the monthly payment of a little more than they would otherwise spend in rent.

"In the second place, these institutions offer very advantageous opportunities to those who would accumulate a substantial sum from small savings."

Then he goes on to say that in the meantime the association may grant temporary loans or, if circumstances render it necessary to discontinue payments for shares, the savings may be withdrawn, netting a very satisfactory return on the investment.

Mr. Edwin F. Howell, Chairman of the Committee on Farm Credits of the United States League of Building and Loan Associations, had this to say in a recent conference in New York.

"The advances of civilization have brought into touch every nation on the face of the globe, and the economy of production, which means the feeding, clothing and housing of humanity, is the problem to be solved in its widest sense. We work for nothing else. The ingenuity of man is directed solely to the production of these three necessaries of life with the smallest expenditure of labor.

"The overabundance is saved and termed the wealth of the nation. Unfortunately, these savings are not held by the laboring man. This, of course, is proved by the evidence that the production or savings of humanity are not in possession of the man who produces them. The producer works and the non-producer saves.

"The injustice of this condition is apparent to all of us, and present conditions have no defender among the thoughtful classes. Two remedies are proposed: Socialism, which is still further centralizing the means of production and the wealth, or savings of the community into the hands of a few, and that few the most powerful, selfish factor, the gov-

ernment; or cooperation, which means decentralization and the financing of every industry by means of its own savings.

"Cooperation applied to the housing problem is already far advanced, there being 6,300 home-owning associations in the United States with 2,500,000 enrolled members and $1,130,000,000 already invested in cooperative home-owning. These institutions are generally known as building and loan associations throughout the United States; in New York, they are called savings and loan associations and in Massachusetts, cooperative banks. They are increasing at the rate of ten per cent per annum, and, if they be undisturbed and continue to increase in that ratio, as they should do under the great stimulus of a cooperative movement, will, within fifty years, control the housing problem of the country and place it upon a mutual cooperative plan."

There is another kind of cooperative banking institution, called Remedial Loan Associations, of which there are nearly forty in this country, organized under a law similar to the Massachusetts law of 1909, Chapter 419, with a total capitalization of over $8,600,000, the purpose of which is to invest, save or borrow money to the best advantage. Cooperation is the keynote to these organizations. Its success depends on its members, and all its members share in the benefits of all its transactions Membership is restricted to people of honesty and industry and prompt payment of obligations is a fundamental requirement To the atrocious activities of so-called loan sharks may be ascribed the reason for creating this form of banking.

Shortly before his death, J. P. Morgan declared that the asset which he regarded as most valuable in a borrower was character and character should be the basis of the Savings-Loan Department and it should give to members a credit service not now accessible. It should be formed with a limited liability, the issue of shares unrestricted—the price not more than ten dollars—and the benefits of the service should be open to every one from the line of real poverty to the very edge of wealth. The keynote should be character and responsibility, and business should be done largely on personal surety, by the simple endorsement of one or two members for another. Such an organization would be an enormous convenience to clerks, day laborers, mechanics, tradesmen, manufacturers, farmers, merchants and professional men in extending loans and encouraging thrift. Each member should have one vote only, irrespective of the number of shares held. The committee of discounts and the committee of credits should have charge of the secret records, which will contain information as to the safe credit value of every member, within which he may borrow without requiring especial consideration of the loan. If the recorded estimate of any member should decline during the time the loan is extended or for any one for whom borrower is surety, the debtor should be called upon to make up the difference, either by reducing the loan, securing another surety or depositing collateral on pain of withdrawal of the loan or refusal to renew. The rate of interest charged for loans should be the same as that charged by national banks except that small temporary loans should be at a higher rate not exceeding one per cent per month.

The profits from the business, after deducting interest to shareholders at the ordinary savings bank rates, should be turned over to the treasurers of the various churches interested; in proportion to the number of members enrolled in the active members register of said church who are in good standing, with the stipulation that twenty-five per cent at least of this fund shall be distributed in annuities to communicants.

The Employment Department, if organized, should be conducted by a committee appointed by the president, and serve without pay but may employ a clerk or secretary to attend to details of the business.

The unemployed, like the poor, are always with us and have been recognized as being divided into three classes: the employable, the unemployable and the vagrant. Of course the distinction is not always clear in the individual but is useful in the operation of an employment bureau, with the understanding that those who though able to work are unwilling to do so, like vagrants, will not be helped much, while the unemployable, that is, those who are willing to work but are deficient, mentally or physically, through their own fault or otherwise, might be helped to some extent by colonizing them

on farms, or in public road construction and thus earn something toward their keep. Such a department would be of great service in finding work for the employable and the following statistics from 379 Young Men's Christian Associations will give an idea of the scope of the undertaking. Last year they filled 32,267 situations. Of these, 19,030 were found by sixteen departments, handled by forty-five trained experts in the largest cities. These men work on a system of cooperation and open up a vast network of opportunity to young men, not only to find, but fit themselves for, their right place in life.

In conclusion, let us remember that now is the time to act and that the great physical and economic forces, making for the exterior growth of society, are the everlasting inward conditions that tend to make men human. Give men decent homes and reasonable hours of work, and you have done little for them unless they grow not only more clean, but more just, faithful, chaste and honorable. Give them a higher ideal of their personal life. Show them that an idle life is a public tax and you straightway promote general social progress, whose fruit shows itself in increased supplies of visible goods. The end and outcome of development and progress is the making of men of good will. It is everywhere at work as never before. Let us exert ourselves for the fellowship of all just and friendly people of every race and nation in the spirit of good will, for where good will is, morality and religion are one and inseparable. Cooperation is the physical or concrete expression of the gospel of good will; it is the evolution of the inherent primeval instinct of self-preservation, and through its instrumentality the church may become a powerful, irresistible, indispensable institution of society.

Our Readers' Exchange

To the Editor of the Unitarian Advance:

Much of the well-meaning pacifist literature of the day seems to be tinged with a discouraging note of cynicism and materialism. Like many of the arguments for a certain kind of socialism, the idea seems to pervade the subject that the most important thing in this world is to protect human *bodies* from cold, hunger, suffering and death. The argument is made, by implication, at least, that nothing in the past was great and important enough that men should die for it.

Throughout this literature of the day runs a cynical view of history that is very distressing. The contributions of your most militant pacifist tend at last to interpret history as an ignoble strife of economic factions all pursued for utterly selfish ends. Were there no good wars any time, no great idealism anywhere, nothing any time worth fighting or dying for? Washington and Bunker Hill, Paul Revere and Nathan Hale, Valley Forge and Lincoln, the Gettysburg address and the Second Inaugural, all seem to be discounted and belittled. We are left to wonder whether anything but pacifism ever has been worth while. Are we to believe that the Revolution and the Civil War were not worth the price and perhaps were instigated and furthered for individual selfish ends? Who knows that Paul Revere himself was not interested in army contracts?

We seem to get the idea also that English civilization from the beginning and down to our day has been utterly besotted and represents nothing high and noble. Is it all a story "of political rivalries, diplomatic deceits, armament competitions, trade wars, selfish nationalism"? The long, hard struggle for civil and religious liberty that we now enjoy, that even gives free churches and a freedom of the press that permits us to openly charge ignoble motives to any of the great of any age and country, this all came through some one in the history of the world who was willing to suffer and die for a great ideal.

One of the fallacies in much of this argument for pacifism seems to be the tendency to maintain that the supreme duty in this world is to protect and save life instead of protecting and saving ideas and ideals. We are told of the carnage and the suffering and the amount of blood spilt, and we are left to infer that it was all unnecessary and all for ignoble ends. Let us have peace, but in order to have peace let us not have dishonor. It seems to be forgotten that, like a man, a nation may save its life and lose its soul.

ALBERT S. OSBORN.

New York, July 8, 1916.

American Social Ideals

By Arthur Warner Littlefield.

A CELEBRATED American theologian once wrote, "The worst thing about a narrow orthodoxy is that it gives rise to an equally narrow anti-orthodoxy."

The principle applies everywhere—abnormal conditions produce equally abnormal conditions in corrective opposition, neutralizing each other, and reducing the abnormal to the normal once more.

This nation is witnessing the rise of an abnormal theory of social economics as the offset and neutralizing corrective of a centralized economic condition that has produced much disorder in America. We are threatened with a social democracy that would, if successful, destroy the American ideal of self-directive freedom for each citizen. Its slogan is, "The social control of wealth under democratic authority."

An author (presumably, from the name, of European extraction) takes the ground that the social ideals of Lincoln, as were those of Jefferson, are not adapted for this modern age. Jefferson and Lincoln, as does America, stood for the equal opportunity of all to the right of individual liberty and personal self-direction, under popular government that, while defending citizens from predatory and lawless neighbors, and making secure the means of inter-communication, interferes as little as possible with the personal affairs of its people. "All government rests upon the consent of the governed"; "the best government is that which governs the least"; "these died that the nation might have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, should not perish from the earth"—these are the American ideals, and Lincoln's, which, so says the author, "no longer can help us guide the ship of state over troubled waters." Further quoting her closing words, "Today a broader theory than his is needed, in the social control of wealth, to help consummate his ideal of the democratic state."

This theory, in simple terms, is: the individual must give up all hope of personal liberty and self-direction "so dear to every American heart," and submit himself, wholly, to the control and direction of the group whose authority is democratically administered. This theory sounds strange to American ears; and for the best of reasons: it is the ideal of the Old, not the New, World.

It is an impressive and significant instance of the transference of an ideal, formerly administered by aristocratic and hereditary authority, to democratic administration. Democracy suffered and suffers, in the Old World, from aristocratic group-interference with human liberty and personal self-direction; in religion, civics, and economics. The sufferer rises in revolt; and, according to the great law stated at the beginning of this paper, it contemplates precisely the same method employed by aristocracy, and just as abnormal and, ultimately, detrimental to humanity—the compulsion of the individual by the group. This is oppression, it is assault—albeit, in the name of democracy and, presumably, in intent, *pro bono publico*—upon human liberty! Great crimes may be committed against human rights and liberty by democracy as well as by aristocracy, and as cruel. "Whatever is democratic is right," is not, necessarily, true. Democracy, claiming the right to coerce the individual beyond the rightful and natural limits belonging to the group, is but the spirit of the authoritative aristocracy of the Old World and the ancient order; differing only in that the democratic group is the larger. The Old World stands for coercion; America, for freedom of the individual, which is the right of *responsible self-direction* in all affairs that concern humanity. But the immigrant from the Old World has, too often, brought the coercive ideal of Europe with him, and seeks to establish it democratically in the New World. Against this alien spirit, the coercion of the individual by the group, liberty-loving America (in the very spirit of Jef-

ferson and Lincoln) is arrayed in defense of the right of personal self-direction to the greatest extent possible. America makes, in theory, a clear distinction between things private and things public—a difference which neither aristocratic collectivism nor democratic collectivism seems to recognize. The battle is on between those who would extend governmental authority over individuals, and those who wish to increase individual self-direction; between European standards and American ideals. The authors of American nationality builded better than they knew and that which the fathers founded and their children established remains for the children's children, nurtured in the atmosphere of liberty and self-reliance, to perpetuate and strengthen.

The claim to the right of individual liberty and personal self-direction rests upon a great natural fact: the constitution of the individual, himself. An individual is an inviolate center of consciousness; he is responsible for the activities of life based upon this consciousness. This individual is embodied in a physical frame made for him by society through natural law; for which bodily frame the individual, ultimately, pays by himself cooperating to make other bodies for other individuals. At first wholly *dependent* because *incompetent,* the individual gradually attains independence to just the extent that he acquires capacity for responsible self-direction. Freedom of action is, therefore, the legitimate right of all individuals who have acquired sufficient control of their powers to be able to use them effectively and responsibly. The outward activities of this free and responsible individual must be exercised in connection with his environment, nature and other persons constituted like himself. Inter-communication is, therefore, necessary; hence, the means of communication are common to all, *i. e.,* social. Over these common possessions, society (all the individuals composing the group) has, justly and of right, full jurisdiction. *Eminent domain* is the principle that separates things private from things public. On the one side of this line of demarkation is rightful coercion; on the other side, personal liberty. In all that concerns private affairs, the individual is free; in all that concerns public affairs (chiefly, common defense and the means of inter-communication) the individual surrenders his liberty—voluntarily, if he be right-minded—to the public, *i. e.,* government, for the common good. Things individual and those public are, thus, clearly described and distinctly demarked. Strictly speaking, the public, exercising governmental functions, should confine its activities to the regulation of inter-communication and the defense of individuals from trespass by other individuals and, even, the public (the State) itself; thus leaving private individuals free in the exercise of their own self-directive activities. Such is conceived to be the American ideal of human relationships, the civic life which the fathers founded and for which Jefferson and Lincoln stood and did so much to firmly establish.

But many citizens (native Americans, enamored of Old World standards, and new Americans, bringing with them from over seas ideals conceived in the Old World environment and born of Old World oppression) look askance at the American ideal of a social order founded upon personal liberty and freedom of individual self-direction. These call for a "new order": democratic social control; primarily, of wealth, but logically and inevitably, of all that concerns mankind—religious, civil, economic, reproductive. Some disclaim this more ulterior intent; but wealth is inextricably bound up with other human interests, and to claim jurisdiction over one part of organic being to the exclusion of the other parts is to ignore the nature of humanity. State control of the individual in regard to wealth is impossible, if, in all other matters, the individual is left free; for, the freer the individual (if he be rightfully free, *i. e.,* because he is competent) the more wealth he will accumulate, the more liberal his religious and civic ideals will become, the more insistent his demand for the right of self-direction throughout the whole range of his activities. Social attempt to coerce such free individuals, so far as their wealth is concerned, would mean revolt, civil war. By what right, exclaims the free individual, does the State claim to control my possessions? I earned them, are they not rightfully mine? For, cer-

tainly, the State, like an individual, has moral right only to that which it earns, or gives just equivalent for. To use an expressive phrase of a recent writer: "Whatever is socially earned should be socially owned; whatever is privately earned should be privately owned." Jefferson and Lincoln and all Americans true to the American ideal would subscribe to that ethical principle, which is, being ethically sound, economically valid. The whole trend of progressive civilization has been and is, to increase the freedom of individual self-direction, curtailing, at the same time, and of necessity, authoritative control from without; religious, civil, and economic liberty have been, or are being fought for, valiantly and, in some goodly degree, successfully. Any attempt to restrict such hard-earned freedom is not progress, but reaction, albeit, proposed in the name of democracy, the principle aristocratic authority in the garb of humanity-loving democracy. Therefore, the "social control of wealth" will not help along the ideals for which the best of our really democratic statesmen have stood.

There is much disorder in the body politic at the present time. But this is not because the principles of personal liberty and fair competition between free and self-directive individuals have failed. The real reason is, because *privilege,* democratically authorized, has been so unjustly interfering with personal liberty and honest competition. Specifically, four of these democratically created privileges are to be reckoned with: land monopoly, which permits private individuals to take an unearned increment which belongs to society because society created it; high protection, which takes from another individual money which the receiver did not earn; incorporation of private business, which is governmental privilege conferred upon private individuals for private benefit, which, again, is repugnant to the principle that public privilege shall be conferred upon individuals for public benefit, only; and legislation under party manipulation masquerading as representative government. The Demos has been as active in creating privilege, in these days, as ever was the Aristos of the Old World in earlier days! "Democratic social control" is but the latest form of the theory which many wish to see become the modern-day substitute for the high idealism dear to every heart that throbs with the spirit of America! Democracy stands arraigned of the crime of being untrue to the principles of nature and human nature; she has simply imitated the methods of the aristocracy against which she revolted, without correcting its evils. And not the least of her departures from the spirit of liberty is her threat to take in hand the conditions that are involved in the reproduction of the race, to invade the family, in other words. The question is up: Shall the propagation of the species be left to the initiative of free individuals; or shall it be brought under "democratic social control"? What is true regulation? The establishing of a safe ratio between population and land-productiveness. The American spirit asserts that only in freedom—economic freedom supported by religious and civil liberty—can this ratio be successfully and happily maintained. For free individuals are cautious and solicitous. They are careful not to invite more children into the world than they can provide for both physically and psychically; they endeavor to make the earth more and more productive. Coerced persons exercise neither caution nor manifest solicitude; care is thrown to the winds, and the land is soon over-populated, resulting in untold misery; among such "socially regulated" victims of false democratic theory, Malthus' Law operates with all its brutal force! But among free persons the birth-rate falls to meet the rising level of the land-productiveness which intelligently free individuals make possible. As the acquisition of wealth is vitally related to the productive activities of mankind, "democratic social control" would seem to be confronting itself with a very large problem!

America, against all the world, stands for liberty, for individual self-direction in all matters personal, religious, civic, economic, and for equal opportunity for all in the exercise of this liberty under just law that is consistent with the laws of nature and human nature. The real remedy for the ills of humanity in America is to put into operation the great principles formulated by the creators of American nationality; not to attempt the substitution of new devices brought over

by new Americans from the Old World, which seems to be the present tendency and highly commended because offered in the name of The People. Let Americans, old and new, *stop creating privilege,* and insist upon American ideals as the standard for Americans and the hope for all the world! This done, and there will be little need for the "social control of wealth," or anything else of a really private nature. American ideals, put into practice, would produce an honorable self-reliant and self-directive citizenship that would need little external regulation, seeing that all normal citizens would control themselves and safely, for all concerned, regulate their affairs. Lincoln's (and America's) social ideals are not obsolete; they have not, as yet, been realized. The "aims and ideals of Lincoln are *'not'* being fruitlessly invoked to help pilot the ship of state over troubled waters." The efforts of the "new freedom" are but the strong endeavor of the spirit of America to incarnate itself in the nation and in the world! Liberty, ever more liberty! Out of which comes that voluntary cooperation of free citizens that makes for human progress and the welfare of humanity.

PROFANING THE OLD HYMNS.

Advice to Professor Simon N. Patten, who is "re-writing the old hymns": Don't. The old hymns are achieved literature, and by us are to be taken or left. Don't rewrite them. If you don't like them, write better, or truer. But alas! Professor Patten (who, by the way is a professor of political economy), has already rewritten a considerable number of old hymns, and has put them forth in a book, with the music. The spirit in which he has wrought may be gauged as to its literary as well as its ethical purpose by an examination of the change which he has dared to make in such a classic as Wesley's "Jesus, Lover of My Soul." Here is the first stanza of Wesley's hymn:

Jesus, Lover of my soul,
Let me to thy bosom fly,
While the nearer waters roll,
While the tempest still is high:
Hide me, O my Saviour, hide,
Till the storm of life be past;
Safe into the haven guide,
O, receive my soul at last.

And here is the Patten perversion:

Jesus, Lover of my soul,
Brother, friend and comrade dear,
No temptation can control,
While thy spirit hovers near,
All I treasure from thee came;
Thy kind deeds all people bless.

This is a classic merely doggerelized for the purpose of bringing it into harmony with modern ideas, religious and social. The process is carried through the great hymns, as far as Professor Patten seems to have been able to go with them. He even lays violent and Tupper-like hands on "Lead, Kindly Light."

Such work is an awful perversion of good literature. If the modern spirit in behalf of which Professor Patten pretends to write cannot produce its own hymns, it would do better to go without them. It should not profane the beauty of the old sacred songs. It may be true that this generation does not entertain the same view of the hereafter or of the operations of the Divine Power that the generation of Milton and Isaac Watts entertained. But Milton and Watts, when they sang their gloomier faith, sang it with a vast sincerity that seemed to lay hold upon the very altars of heaven; that sincerity, and the freshness of their power over English words, produced the hymns they wrote; and there is nothing in any language to surpass the majesty of the words and measures of these old English chants. That they were chants of fear as well as of faith does not lessen their solemn beauty; and it is a beauty which deserves better of our generation than the sort of defacement that it has received at Professor Patten's hands.

The new faith assuredly has its own validity, and since that is true, it must have its own emotional expression. It is, indeed, finding that expression. Our own generation has produced many noble hymns in the new sentiment. Whittier wrote:

I know not where His islands lift
Their fronded palms in air;
I only know I cannot drift
Beyond His love and care.

An age which can produce "The Eternal Goodness" and "Nearer My God to Thee" has no need of doggerel perversions of old hymns. We are thoroughly in favor of academic freedom, but we do not believe that this freedom would be violated if the University of Pennsylvania, of whose economic department Professor Patten is doubtless a great ornament, were to admonish him to stick to his own field and leave the hymnal alone.—*From the Boston Transcript.*

A CREED.

This, then, O God! is all my creed:
In the beginning there was still
What there is now, no less, no more;
And at the end of all there will
Be just as much. There is no score
Of final judgment. Wonder's tale
Will never, never all be told.
There will be none without the pale,
No saint elect within the fold.

If, then, this mighty magic world
Has always been, will ever be,
There must be laws within it curled
That spin it thro' eternity.
I see two equal laws obey
One sovran, never-captured Law—
For all this world would melt away
If Heart of Mystery we saw.

And first of these twin equal laws
Is that dynamic force which flows
In life—of every birth the cause—
Replumes the tree, and swells the rose;
Inflames and clouds the violet Spring,
Inhabits all the mighty flood,
The breeze's lightest whispering,
The every impulse of our blood.

That spirit force which cannot tire
Of franchisement, and keeps no troth;
Nor ever rests from building spire
And painting colors on the moth.
A quenchless flame that licks all air,
And lights and drives the wandering star,
That dyes with gold the maiden's hair,
And rives with frost the granite spar.

The second equal law is this:
Implicit deep in all increase
And stir of living things, there is
A nothingness, a fate of peace,
A night, a death, an ebbing down,
A fading out of life. The bush
That burgeons, dons a funeral gown;
And every tune contains its hush.

All forms upswelling have within
Their hearts a static decadence;
In utter stillness does the thin
Reverberation lose its sense;
To ash the spark of spirit dies,
Each revolution of each sphere,
Each swoop of every bird that flies
To its own silly death draws near.

And there's between these laws the leap,
And drive, and stir of endless war;
The sway from rage of lust to sleep,
And all the cosmic whims that mar
Perfection. From this strife is born
All variance of shape and flight—
As clouds of mountain sunset torn
From slumber-gray by flare of light.

Yet these two laws, so fixed apart
As day and night, are brought to fold
Within that one and Sovran Heart
Whose secret never shall be told,
Yet shall thro' time, and thro' all space
With mystery pervade the world,
And make it holier than face
Of dawn that sun and mist have pearled.

That Sovran Heart is Harmony!
Its eyes unseen, its ways unknown.
'Tis utter Justice; boundless Sea
Of Unity; and Secret Throne
Of Love; a spirit Meeting Place
Of vital dust and mortal breath,
That needs no point of time or space
To bind together Life and Death.

'Tis thus, O God! I see the Vast—
Self-fashioned, and Self-Wonderful—
A jewel infinite, so fast
With secret light, can never dull;
It is all Space, so cannot fall,
It is all Motion, may not move.
It is of Time the very all,
And has within itself all Love.

And that brief gathering of dust
And breath—myself—doth bear this All
Resemblance, both of outer crust
And inner fire, perpetual.
I, too, a battlefield of laws,
Am rhymed with Harmony Divine—
That knows, alone, the utter cause
Of me; and can the end define.

—John Galsworthy.

Forward to First Principles

By Louis F. Post,
Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Abstract of lecture delivered at the Sagamore Sociological Conference, June 29.

It is extremely unfortunate that men of affairs have been disposed to ignore ideals with reference to common concerns. Equally unfortunate is it that social idealists have been inclined to disregard practical methods. Ideals and methods should do team work.

That is my reason for urging you "forward" instead of "back" to first principles. "Forward to first principles," implies the adaptation of practical methods to the natural laws of human association. What I propose, is not a leap to ideals, but journey toward them.

Thanks to invention, there need no longer be any lack of food or clothing or shelter for the human race. Why not similar social results from progressive conformity to natural social laws? If there are natural physical laws, isn't it unreasonable to say there are no natural social laws? It is up to us, then, to discover and to utilize natural social law with the same good sense with which we are discovering and utilizing natural physical law.

We ought to be able to agree upon a working hypothesis. What about the Golden Rule, if you are a Christian? What about the second of the two great commandments—if you are either Christian or Jew? What about the Declaration of Independence, if you stand for Americanism? They are all statements of first principles. If you are neither Jew nor Christian, and scorn the first principle of Americanism, what about the testimony of experience?

A large part of the world is convulsed with war. Great nations are doing what individual men would have done not long ago—fighting a duel. They are fighting for "honor," "rights," "places in the sun" and "freedom of the seas." What does that imply? Nothing but what the natural social law of equality of rights would give without war. The war is not caused by that social law; it is caused by disobedience to it. If the world had gone far enough forward to first principles, there would have been no war. Big navies can't give freedom of the seas unless ports are free to commerce; and if the ports of the nations are free to commerce we shall have freedom of the seas without other naval force than enough to prevent piracy. Universal freedom of commerce might not in itself, make universal peace, but it would minimize the causes of war and send most of them to the scrap heap.

But why freedom of the seas and not of the land? There can be no equality of opportunity, no right to life and liberty, as long as anybody is excluded from his place on the planet. When our country is urged to protect American property in Mexico, what do you suppose it means? It means that played-out governments down there have granted American corporations titles to rich mines and almost boundless prairies, that new Mexican leaders are disposed to repeal those grants, and that our nation is urged to make war upon Mexico to save those grants.

A little advance toward first principles would remove that cause of war. We need go no further than to recognize that monopoly of the earth, whether on sea or on land, is no man's right. It violates the principle of equal rights to life and liberty. Vast areas of our public land are passing into monopolistic control. Why not make a beginning in the right direction by subjecting this land to some title dependent upon occupation and use instead of monopolistic grants?

This country made a great advance toward social first principles when it abolished slavery. It will make another when it abolishes land monopoly within its own borders; another, when it joins the nations in making the seas free by making all useful commerce free; another, when it proves to the world that it will never again spend a dollar nor sacrifice a life for conquest.

Let impatient idealists reflect that progress is a matter of going in the right direction and keeping patiently on. Let narrow practical men take note that if they ignore first principles their practical methods will turn to ashes in their hands. By harnessing social ideals to appropriate methods and making them do team work, the journey forward to first principles will carry human society to undreamed of heights of social accomplishment. Not speedily, it may be; for social growth, like all enduring growth, is slow. Not easily, to be sure; for selfishness and ignorance are like devouring lions in the way. But of little moment is it whether the progress be speedy or easy or far at a time. The most important thing is that we go in the right direction. The next important thing is that we follow the line of least resistance. If we pull with the current instead of against it, social progress may go fast and far. For propulsion we need the wisdom of the practical man; for direction we need the vision of the idealist.

MUDDLEHEADEDNESS.

That is what loses more than half the battle in religion. Muddled, general, diffused ideas, lacking in clear point and application, are fatal. Of course we believe in the better life, in character and goodness and truth, in a general sort of way. But practical power and result are not born of generalities.

Outside the realm of religion we recognize this. The limitless sources of energy only do the practical work of the world when we pass from the vague generality that they are pregnant with far-reaching results, to the definite harnessing of their diffused forces.

We frame mirrors to concentrate the sunlight on one definite point and they pump for us the water which is to make a garden of the wilderness. We harness our steam, set it to definite ends, under definite conditions, in the ordered complexity of the engine, and the soft diffused vapor becomes a working giant. Niagara, unfettered and lost at last in Lake Ontario, gets confined, some infinitesimal fraction of her, in the penstocks under the humming dynamos and a city is alive with power and light.

It is its definite channel, even of the most tortuous kind, that gets the river to the sea at last. Channelless it becomes a morass, the breeder of pestilence and the haunt of miasmic vapor. The ruddered liner on the high seas, big with stored and directed energy, is peerless mistress of the storm. Rudderless she is its helpless toy in spite of all her power.

Calvinism was great in the clearness more than in the truth of her ideas. God, hell, judgment, salvation, were to her no empty generalities. Of their definiteness power was born, the power to mold men of iron in dark and cruel days. Heritors of nobler truths, we have lost her power because we have surrendered the clearness of her thought. Not even the nobility of her ideals made for the heroic greatness of Puritanism so much as her setting those ideals in definite ways towards ends that she had made clear to her soul. Well does the epistle which Luther scorned say of the man of wavering mind "let not such a man think that he shall receive anything from the Lord."

The thought of God and the universe, the fuller understanding of himself, the splendor of the wider vision open to man today are forces of limitless possibilities. They teem with the power of which nobler life may be born if we will. But not without clear aim and ordered purpose. Lacking it the native hue of resolution is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought, which were it only clear would be the mother of nobler resolution still.

Why are we banded together as a church? What aim unites us? How do we propose to catch its inspiration? What are you or I doing toward its attainment and what do we further clearly intend to do? Where men gather together with definite, resolute, clear consciousness of what things like these actually mean to them a power arises on the earth. But to the church of delightful generalities only sleep comes. It is not the sleep of which the vigor of the morning is born, but the impotent sleep of the drifter on a tideless sea.

One hindrance to high living is the lack of clear ideas.—W. Hanson Pulsford.

Put kindness into your daily living. Think how you would desire to be treated and then do likewise to others.

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

This has been an unusual summer in this district in many particulars. Several churches with vacant pulpits have heard candidates during the vacation season. The Minneapolis church as a result of such summer services extended a call to Rev. John H. Dietrich of Spokane, Wash., who has accepted the call and will begin his work the first Sunday in November. This church has just completed its repayment to the Church Building Loan Fund of the $15,000 borrowed when the present building was erected. The Dayton church has conducted a quite unusual candidating campaign, advertising in the publications of other denominations as well as in our own papers. It has also sent out to a large number of our ministers a letter describing the history, the present constituency and the conscious purpose of the church. It has thus received suggestions from a great variety of sources and is busily engaged in a study of the varied suggestions which have reached it. The probabilities are that a leader will be secured in the early fall. The church at Humboldt, Iowa, heard a candidate the last two Sundays of August and has very likely taken action before this reaches our readers.

The summer has been unusual also in the fact that the secretary, except for a few days at a time, has been constantly present at the office and has found his time fully occupied with the affairs of the Conference. Candidating campaigns, State Conference programs, fellowship applications and visits from members of the Meadville School who were attending Chicago University for the summer quarter lent a variety of interest to the work. The summer has also been unusual in the breaking of all records for sustained high temperatures. This was true of the whole district, but especially true of Chicago which, for several days in succession, had the high record for the whole United States. As usual, services were maintained through July in our college town churches. We have to remind our readers from time to time that Chicago is included in this list of "college towns." Mr. Pulsford preached through July, and at Lincoln Centre Rev. Harry Foster Burns of the Oshkosh Congregational Church delivered a series of sermons on "Christianity and Civilization's Crisis" which covered all the Sundays of July and August. The secretary preached at Madison, Wis., the last Sunday before the closing of the church. The latter part of August he took part in the ordination of Mrs. Lappala, wife of our Finnish missionary at Virginia, Minn., Mrs. Lappala having been commissioned by the American Unitarian Association. The presence of Mr. Van Tassel at a summer camp near Virginia made it possible to have a regular council and a fair representation of our ministers upon the program.

The first of the State Conferences to hold its meeting will be Iowa. The program is not yet complete, but the outstanding features are already determined. It will be a joint conference of Universalists and Unitarians held at Sioux City on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, October 3rd, 4th and 5th. Mayor R. J. Andrews will give the address of welcome. Responses will be given by Rev. J. A. Kyle and Mr. J. B. Cropper. The address on the opening evening will be given by Rev. Richard W. Boynton of Buffalo, N. Y., who is to supply the pulpit at St. Paul for a number of Sundays. Separate business sessions of the two bodies will be held. The occasional sermon on Wednesday morning will be given by a Universalist minister yet to be chosen and this will be followed by a communion service in charge of Rev. R. D. Van Tassel. Wednesday afternoon will be devoted to separate women's meetings and to a joint session at which each of the two bodies will be represented by a layman and a laywoman. In the evening a sermon will be delivered by Rev. Lee S. McCollester, D. D., President of the Universalist General Convention. Thursday morning, after the separate business sessions, the joint session will discuss "Church Efficiency." The afternoon will be devoted to work of the Sunday School and the Young People's organizations. The Conference will close with a fellowship banquet on Thursday evening. The entertaining church will provide lodgings and breakfast for the delegates. The entertainment committee

consists of Mrs. W. F. Knittle, 918 Douglas St., and Mrs. O. S. Dean, 1632 Douglas St.

The meeting of the Illinois Conference will be held at Geneseo, October 10th and 11th. The general subject will be "The Church as a Generator of Religious Experience." We postpone until our October issue the printing of the full program, but select the following topics as showing the trend of the program: "The meaning and value of religious experience to the individual. What can it be to and do for the average man?"; "How can the church help the seeker to gain this experience? (1) By public worship, or other group effort; and (2) by directing the individual in his private efforts?"; "The dependence of religious experience on the idea of God"; "How can the idea of God be presented to the modern man so as to convince him of its validity and of its value as the foundation of religious experience?"; "The religious experience of women"; "Does the World need and is it ready for a great revival? What will the characteristics of a world transforming religion be?"; "How would a world revival affect national and international life? Its effect upon industrial, social and political reform, and on world peace?". To make still clearer the purpose of the committee we add the statement sent to each one of the churches in the Conference with the programs. The chairman of the hospitality committee is Mrs. H. B. Fitts Jerrell, 728 S. State Street, Geneseo. The statement follows:

THE PROGRAM.

For the purpose of promoting unity of discussion it is stated that the committee had the following thoughts in mind while preparing the program:

1. That there is a religious spirit latent in every man which, if released, will exercise an uplifting and transforming influence on his life.

2. That this spirit fails of adequate expression today partly because of its association with old beliefs which are no longer believable.

3. That the religious spirit is not dependent on those beliefs, or, indeed, on any other intellectual theories, but is itself an original and primary faculty, the main cause of the theories which are proposed to account for and support it.

4. That its main function is to enable man to take a right attitude toward the Great Life of which he is part, to be loyal to it, and to be brave, strong, faithful, and loving in the face of those aspects of the Life which present themselves to him.

5. That a church is a group of people associated together for the purpose of helping each other in the release and cultivation of the religious spirit, in the acquirement of religious experience, and in the development of the religious consciousness, to the end that it may control the inward attitude and lead to courage, confidence, power and faith.

6. That the business of this Conference is to discuss the nature of this religious experience which we seek, its place in the lives of men and women, and, especially what the modern church may do by teaching, by training, by adoption of a technique, a method, a curriculum, or of any other exercise, means, or inspiration, that will aid in the development and guidance of the religious spirit, and in the strengthening and conscious control of our inner powers.

AMERICA FOR ME.

Oh, London is a man's town, there's power in the air;
And Paris is a woman's town, with flowers in her hair;
And it's sweet to dream in Venice, and it's great to study Rome;
But when it comes to living, there is no place like home.

I know that Europe's wonderful, yet something seems to lack;
The Past is too much with her, and the people looking back.
But the glory of the Present is to make the Future free—
We love our land for what she is and what she is to be.

Oh, it's home again, and home again, America for me!
I want a ship that's westward bound to plow the rolling sea,
To the blessed Land of Room Enough beyond the ocean bars,
Where the air is full of sunlight and the flag is full of stars.

—Henry van Dyke.

IS HUMANITY FOREVER DOOMED TO "WAR"?

OR CAN WE SOLVE THE PROBLEM FROM A RATIONALISTIC, SCIENTIFIC, EXPEDIENT, HUMAN BASIS?

NEW WARS FOR OLD

(Just Published)

BY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

IS A STATEMENT

OF RADICAL PACIFISM IN TERMS OF FORCE VERSUS NON-RESISTANCE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE FACTS AND PROBLEMS OF THE GREAT WAR.

Selected from the Table of Contents:

The Logic of Force.
The Fallacies of Force.
The Meaning of Non-Resistance.
Exemplars of Non-Resistance, Ancient and Modern.
The Practicability of Non-Resistance.
Is War Ever Justifiable?
Is Permanent and Universal Peace to be Desired?
The Duty and Opportunity of America Today.

$1.50 net

At your booksellers, or direct from publishers, postpaid, if you prefer.

Publishers, DODD, MEAD & CO., New York

For What Do Unitarian Churches Stand?

For the religion of the spirit, as distinguished from the religion of authority, whether of pope or book, of priest or synod. They accept "truth for authority, not authority for truth," and believe in the never ceasing revelation of God to man in all lands and ages.

For freedom of thought and word, believing that freedom and truth go ever hand in hand. Therefore they do not attempt to prescribe the belief of either their ministers or their laymen, nor do they fear diversity of opinion as incompatible with unity of spirit.

For the fuller realization of the divine in the universe and in the heart of man. They believe that God is Infinite Spirit, the source of all life and truth, and that something of the nature of God may be apprehended by study of humanity, and of the world about us.

For belief in the divine humanity of Jesus, because they hold that all souls are children of the Infinite Spirit, and that the divine sonship is a universal manifestation, not a unique phenomenon.

For civic reform, economic justice, and social regeneration, believing that the mission of the church is now and here to establish the divine commonwealth of love and peace on earth.

For eternal life—not merely another life of blissful ease, which we shall discover beyond the grave; but life which already lays hold upon immortality because it is even now in harmony with God's divine order.